DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 135 293 HE 008 654

AUTHOR Martorana, S.V.; And Others
TITLE Cooperative Projects among Colleges and Universities.
INSTITUTION Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 61
NOTE 51p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Colleges; *Cooperative Planning; *Cooperative Programs; *Higher Education; *Interinstitutional Cooperation; Problems; Program Administration; Program Descriptions; Program Design; Program Development; Program Evaluation; Universities

ABSTRACT

The concept and history of interinstitutional cooperation are discussed. Case histories of some successful programs in the U.S. are described, and include their scope of operation, the character of the cooperative arrangements, administrative procedures, provisions for evaluation, favorable and unfavorable factors, and related considerations. Principles and guidelines for establishing programs are presented, as is a bibliography. (MSE)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED135293

Curriculum
F19

OE-50020

Cooperative Projects Among Colleges and Universities

HE 008 654

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
Office of Education

2

HIGHLIGHTS

THIS REPORT identifies and describes 29 cooperative projects in higher education.

These projects, whose primary function has been to increase the adequacy and improve the quality of higher education, have been operative at local, State, and regional levels.

While the concept of interinstitutional cooperation in higher education is not new, it has only recently come to be widely acknowledged, publicized, and discussed.

There is a definite need today for a more systematic, regular, and detailed reporting of cooperative programs in higher education, including the type, scope, planning, administration, evaluation, and financing of such programs.

To be most meaningful and most widely effective, cooperative programs in higher education should be planned and executed, not within the strictly isolated environment of the institutions concerned; they should rather be coordinated with related programs of other agencies within the local, State, regional, and national matrices.

Adequate planning, competent administration, periodic evaluation, and subsequent modification as required are highly essential to insure the maximum success of cooperative programs in higher education.

Improved mechanisms for cooperation among higher education institutions, and between these institutions and other agencies which contribute to and draw upon their resources, can greatly assist in the difficult process of relating individual efforts to the needs of the Nation.

OE–50020

COOPERATIVE PROJECTS AMONG COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

By

S. V. MARTORANA
Chief, State and Regional Organization

JAMES C. MESSERSMITH
Specialist for State and Regional Organization

and

LAWRENCE O. NELSON
Consultant
Division of Higher Education

Circular No. 649

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF,
Secretary

OFFICE OF EDUCATION
STERLING M. McMURRIN,
Commissioner

Foreword

HIGHER EDUCATION in the United States can boast a history of fairly successful response to many challenges. Faced with ever-increasing demands and opportunities, higher education now has the task of finding the material resources and manpower to meet the challenges of the present decade. One partial solution to these challenges may be found in the practice of interinstitutional cooperation.

The present publication provides a case-history description of some successful programs of interinstitutional cooperation: their scope of operation, the character of cooperative arrangements, administrative procedures, provisions for evaluation, favorable and unfavorable factors, and related considerations.

It is the hope of the Division of Higher Education that this report will stimulate the interest of college and university personnel concerning the potentialities of interinstitutional cooperation. Not only economy, but important qualitative progress, may be achieved by this device.

HOMER D. BABBIDGE, JR.
Assistant Commissioner for Higher Education

ERNEST V. HOLLIS
Director, College and University Administration Branch

Contents

	Page
Foreword	iii
Chapter I. Interinstitutional Cooperation: An Emerging Concept in Higher Education	1
Definition and Delimitation	1
Historical Background	1
Current Need for Interinstitutional Cooperation	2
Increased Enrollments	2
Limitation of Finances	3
Shortage of Qualified Faculty Personnel	3
Reasons for Cooperation	4
Possible Areas of Cooperation	4
Recorded Support for Cooperative Programs	5
Summary and Conclusions	5
Chapter II. Interinstitutional Cooperation at Local, State, and Regional Levels	6
Bilateral Cooperation: State and Local Levels	7
Earlham College—Indiana University	7
Flint Junior College—The University of Michigan	7
Harvard University—Massachusetts Institute of Technology	8
Lowell Technological Institute—Massachusetts Institute of Technology	8
Ohio State University Cooperative Agreements	8
Wells College—Cornell University	9
Williams College—Sprague Electric Company	9
Multilateral Cooperation: State and Local Levels	10
Amherst, Mount Holyoke, Smith, and University of Massachusetts	10
Bryn Mawr, Haverford, and Swarthmore	11
Claremont Graduate School	12
Intercollegiate Program of Graduate Studies in the Humanities and Social Sciences	12
Harrisburg Area Center for Higher Education	12
Temple University Cooperative Project in Teacher Education	13
Indiana Conference on Higher Education	14
Lowell Institute Cooperative Broadcasting Council	15
Minnesota Intercollege Cooperative Project	16
The University Center in Nashville	16
Conservation Laboratory—Interuniversity Cooperation	17
Interinstitutional Program of Teaching by Television	18
The University Center in Virginia	19
University Center in Georgia	20
Three-College: 3–2 Program in Engineering	21
Western Reserve University, Case Institute of Technology, and the Cleveland Museum of Natural History	21
Maine Cooperative Project in Educational Television	22
Interinstitutional Cooperation on a Larger Scene	22
Southern Regional Training Program in Public Administration	23

CONTENTS

	Page
Associated Colleges of the Midwest	23
Associated Rocky Mountain Universities	24
Committee on Institutional Cooperation ["Big Ten" Institutions and University of Chicago]	25
Interuniversity—Atomic Energy Commission Cooperative Projects	26
Summary and Conclusions	27
Chapter III. Planning for Interinstitutional Cooperation in Higher Education	28
Interinstitutional Cooperation in the Washington, D.C., Area: A Case Study	
Inception of Conference	28
First Conference Session	29
Current Cooperative Projects in Higher Education in the Washington Metropolitan Area (November 1959)	30
Second Conference Session	32
Summary and Conclusions	33
Chapter IV. Helps and Hindrances to Cooperative Projects	35
Factors Conducive to Cooperation	35
Administrative Leadership	35
Geographical Proximity	35
Recognition of Service Areas	36
Threat of Invasion or New Competition	36
Threat of Outside Control	36
External Influences	36
Factors Deterrent to Cooperative Arrangements	37
Summary and Conclusions	37
Chapter V. Principles and Guidelines for Establishing Interinstitutional Programs	39
Effecting Heightened Cooperation Between Institutions	39
Some Tentative Principles	40
Concluding Statement	41
Selected References	43
Table	
Interinstitutional Cooperation in Higher Education in the Washington, D.C., Area—1959	31

CHAPTER I

Interinstitutional Cooperation: An Emerging Concept in Higher Education

TODAY higher education is caught in an increasingly difficult dilemma: strong demands are being placed upon it for the establishment of new curricular programs and offerings and for the improvement and expansion of existing programs and services; at the same time, higher education finds itself limited in financial, material, and personnel resources and facilities. Colleges and universities are looking more and more to interinstitutional programs as one means of solving these and related problems.

This publication presents an overview of interinstitutional cooperation in higher education, in its philosophical and historical setting and with special consideration of its present status and future potentialities. The varied nature and broad scope of cooperative arrangements among higher education institutions are concretely demonstrated by the delineation of a number of representative programs which have been or are now in existence.

Those activities which represent instances of interinstitutional cooperation among colleges and universities at the local or State level have been of primary concern in this report. However, reference is also made to certain cooperative projects embracing *interstate* regional groups of higher education institutions, not only to point up the possibilities of such broad geographic arrangements, but also to show their implications for State and local area programs.

It was not intended that this report include all cooperative arrangements, past and present, among colleges and universities in this country. Time and economic limitations required that the major attention be confined to a description of selected programs from the substantial number reported to date in the literature. Those selected for comment, however, are believed to be illustrative of the progress colleges and universities have made in recent years toward interinstitutional cooperation and the prospects such programs have for more effective services to the constituencies served by higher institutions.

Definition and Delimitation

The term *interinstitutional cooperation* refers to joint efforts or operations wherein two or more colleges or other educational organizations agree with some measure of formal action to join forces, pool resources, or otherwise work together for the attainment of a common educational objective. In this report, this definition is limited to agreements entered into *voluntarily* by colleges and universities and related educational organizations. Interinstitutional arrangements for working together which have been effected through legislation or executive mandate are not considered here. Neither are such interinstitutional programs as involve athletics, forensics, debate, music, or similar activities included.

State and local area cooperative projects involving two higher institutions or related education organizations are described as *bilateral* projects; those involving more than two institutions or related educational organizations are described as *multilateral* projects.

Historical Background

While the concept of interinstitutional cooperation in higher education is not new, it has only relatively recently come to be widely acknowledged, publicized, and discussed. Historically, the separateness of colleges appears to have been primarily due to three factors: (1) the "ivory tower" concept of many higher education institutions,

which separated them from the community; (2) the self-sufficient concept, which separated them from one another; and (3) the highly selective nature of single-purpose programs, which drew relatively few students to any one college. In many instances, both the desire and the need to establish cooperative arrangements and programs were lacking. Where the need did exist, the benefits and potentialities of working together for a common purpose were often not clearly envisioned.

Within the past decade or so the literature descriptive of interinstitutional cooperation in higher education has grown considerably in volume and variety. Types of cooperative arrangements and the variety of institutions involved have increased. Planning, organization, financing, administration, evaluation, and other facets of the problem have been given increased study and coverage in the public and educational press. Among the factors which have accelerated voluntary cooperation among colleges are the desire to provide better programs at a smaller cost to the student and the college; the inability, alone, to provide the staff, facilities, and services for these more complex and costly programs; and a more widespread acceptance of a social climate that recognizes the virtues of interdependence as well as those of self-sufficiency.

Most of the articles, surveys, and reports descriptive of interinstitutional cooperative arrangements in higher education have appeared within the last 10 or 15 years. A bibliography of resources relevant to the subject is included in this bulletin; it seeks to bring up to date a bibliography of 79 items contained in a 1957 report on interinstitutional cooperation in higher education and called by the author "the more important literature on interinstitutional cooperation already existing."[1] Of the 79 items, 4 were published between 1930 and 1939; 9 were published between 1940 and 1949; and the remaining 66—84 percent of the total—were published between 1950 and 1957. The bibliography in this bulletin includes 70 items published or released since 1957. Yet it must be recognized that many such cooperative arrangements, past and present, have undoubtedly not been reported in the literature.

[1] Merton W. Ertell. *Interinstutional Cooperation in Higher Education.* Albany, N.Y.: New York State Education Department, 1957. 118 p.

Two fairly comprehensive studies of interinstitutional cooperation in higher education were published a quarter of a century ago. They are: *Interinstitutional Agreements in Higher Education*, by Daniel S. Sanford, Jr., published in 1934 by Teachers College, Columbia University, and *Cooperation and Coordination in Higher Education*, by Arthur J. Klein and Franklin V. Thomas, published in 1938 by the American Council on Education. Sanford's study was restricted to formal and *written* agreements existing between higher education institutions. The Klein-Thomas study grew out of overtures made by the Association of Governing Boards of State Universities and Allied Institutions to the American Council on Education to initiate a study of the possibilities of regional development of certain specialized scientific and educational activities. Ertell's 1957 study, reference to which has already been made, gives detailed treatment to interinstitutional cooperation in the State of New York; however, much of the report is nevertheless broader in scope. Up to its time, it represents perhaps the most recent comprehensive treatment of the subject.

Current Need for Interinstitutional Cooperation

In the past it was practically possible and perhaps educationally advantageous for colleges and universities to operate unilaterally, each determining its own goals and programs and seeking its own resources. A number of factors can be identified to illustrate how the current social, economic, and political setting is making this a much more difficult path for an institution of higher learning to follow.

Increased Enrollments

A primary causative factor in the increased need of higher institutions to establish cooperative programs in order to satisfy clientele demands more adequately is that of steadily rising college and university enrollments.

In a recent publication of the United States Office of Education, the 1960 opening (fall) degree-credit student enrollment total for all colleges and universities of the United States was

reported as 3,610,007.[2] From this point it is estimated that opening (fall) enrollments will rise to a total of approximately 6,000,000 students in all public and private institutions of higher education by 1970.

In situations where special admissions requirements and enrollment restrictions are not established institutional policy, these figures are a cause for concern. They may be less so to those institutions which have decided to hold the line on future admissions and are further committed to a limitation of institutional size. Even in these cases, however, the side effects of generally growing pressures in college enrollments may be influential in underscoring the need for and in stimulating interest in the establishment of interinstitutional cooperative programs, provided that conditions otherwise are encouraging.

Limitation of Finances

A second factor influencing the need for interinstitutional programs among colleges, universities, and related organizations is that of limited financial resources with which to underwrite the cost of higher education.

As the numbers of students seeking higher education in the years immediately ahead increase, so, too, will the need for a greater amount of dollars be increasingly felt. These two factors together make it imperative that colleges and universities seek additional funds for the maintenance of current programs and the admission of larger numbers of students. Office of Education estimates show a requirement for over 18 billion dollars for capital needs of higher education in the decade ahead. Operating budgets are rising steadily likewise.

Writing on the financing of higher education currently and in the years ahead, Seymour E. Harris of Harvard University states that the educational and general budget of 1957–58 for all of higher education in the United States was slightly above $3.6 billion. He further estimates that this figure will eventually increase by the year 1969–70 to a total expenditure for the same purposes of $9.8 billion. In regard to this rise in operating budgets and the major reason for a large portion of this increase, he says: "Hence the increase is $6.2 billion, or about 170 percent. Since enrollment is expected to rise by about 90 percent, it can be assumed that more than one-half of the rise is to be associated with increased enrollments."[3] Thus it is again evident that a considerable portion of the funds increase will be tied to the enrollment surge.

Harris also states that the $9.8 billion figure is for operating budgets only and does not take into account the possibility of a 20 percent increase in the next 10 years due to inflation, which would raise the total financial needs even higher. He sounds one optimistic note, however, when he says in regard to his highest estimate, "Economies may cut this figure."

One possible means of achieving a segment of these desired economies is through interinstitutional cooperation. This is true both in terms of the expenses for current operations and outlays for capital facilities and institutional equipment. In view of the critical situation that may be in prospect in the adequacy of available funds to underwrite increased costs in higher education, no approach to great economic effectiveness ought to be overlooked.

Shortage of Qualified Faculty Personnel

The need for interinstitutional cooperation is also heightened because of the current and projected shortage of adequately trained teaching staff. At the present time, there are strong indications that the growth and expansion of colleges and universities—but more important, the adequate education of our young people—will be impeded during the coming 10-year period, due to a shortage of qualified instructional personnel. The universities of the United States are falling short of producing the number of doctorates required to man the classrooms of higher learning. The current rate of production is approximately 9,360 doctorates per year. If it is assumed that this rate will continue during the next 10 years, and that approximately 60 percent (the present estimated rate) will continue to enter into em-

[2] *Opening (Fall) Enrollment in Higher Education, 1960: Institutional Data.* U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1960. p. 1.

[3] Seymour E. Harris. Financing of Higher Education: Broad Issues. *Financing Higher Education, 1960–70.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1959. p. 35.

ployment in higher education, approximately 16.7 percent of the total new professional staff during this period will hold the doctoral degree. This compares with 31.4 percent for entering staff members in 1953–54, 26.7 percent for 1955–56, and 23.8 percent for 1958–59.[4]

In addition to the shortage in the production of doctor's degrees, one must remember that, even if the institutions could meet the expected need of total numbers for faculty purposes, a large portion of this group yearly find their way into the fields of business, industry, and government. When one consults the estimates which have been made regarding future faculty size, it is readily apparent that the 1970 figure of approximately 402,000 total full-time equivalent faculty needed may not be met.[5]

There are many plans and suggestions for meeting this need for teachers, such as the increased use of more persons holding the master's degree, or rehiring retired persons possessing the needed qualifications. A partial satisfaction of this need may also be brought about by the use of cooperative curricular and teaching arrangements involving two or more higher institutions.

Reasons for Cooperation

As a general rule, reports of various types or examples of cooperative ventures involving colleges and universities point to one or more reasons which create an initial interest in conducting such programs. A relationship between the reasons advanced and factors creating a need for cooperation, such as were presented above, can be established. Among the reasons frequently given for considering cooperative arrangements are that such endeavors provide:

1. More effective utilization of resources, both physical and personnel.
2. Program enrichment in the way of broadened offerings and a more stable selection.
3. Economy of operation by reducing faculty, plant, and fund needs to an operational level consistent with sound administration.
4. Enhanced community service through the selection of competence areas by cooperating institutions and through reduced duplication of offerings.
5. Institutional stimulation embracing students, faculty, administration, and staff.

Possible Areas of Cooperation

Given a willingness on the part of the leaders of higher institutions, boards of trustees, administrators, and staff members, there appears to be no aspect of college operation which is beyond the bounds of collective effort. Examples have been reported to indicate that cooperation among institutions is possible in such broad matters as statewide and regional planning for a frontal attack on the problems of higher education during the next decade to as specific a matter as joint purchasing of fuel oil to capitalize on bulk purchase prices. Ertell[6] has provided a compilation of possible areas of cooperation which appear to be both comprehensive and realistic. Included as possible areas of cooperation are the following:

1. Planning
2. Providing programs and educational opportunities for students
3. Sharing faculty resources
4. Sharing physical facilities
5. Use of joint classes
6. Library activities
7. Contracts for services
8. Business affairs, administrative practices, and fund raising
9. Activities with other cultural institutions
10. Other cooperative activities

An additional area of cooperation, which does not seem to fall into any of the categories listed here, yet has meaning for all colleges, was described by Hanson in a recent article on college communications when he wrote:

> My second step in a broad program would be an interinstitutional communications program.
>
> Colleges and universities should combine, within the areas of their main constituencies, to send out cooperative newsletters, pictorial tabloids, traveling exhibits, and combined-talent programs. They should also combine to take paid space in newspapers, especially weeklies, and time on radio and TV sta-

[4] *Ten-Year Objectives in Education: Higher Education Staffing and Physical Facilities, 1960–61 through 1969–70.* Washington: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. p. 20, Jan. 17, 1961.

[5] Ibid. (Full-time equivalent for teaching—258,000; full-time equivalent for administrative service—64,000; full-time equivalent for research—80,000.)

[6] Op. cit., p. 4–7.

tions. Every doctor's office, every barber shop, every waiting station in every city and village should receive information on the real achievements of higher education, as reflected in local institutions within the State or region where the cities and villages are located. In addition, the opinion leaders in each city and village should get personal copies of a combined institutional newsletter.[7]

In view of the many phases of college and university operations which can be approached and handled jointly by two or more institutions, a greater consideration by institutional leaders of the advantages to be gained from such action is to be expected. Direct outcomes in education and economic effectiveness and indirect gains in public understanding are both possible.

Recorded Support for Cooperative Programs

Beyond the consideration of the foregoing practical and current problems facing higher education, there are also several important philosophical justifications for considering interinstitutional cooperation in college and university operation and administration. Both practical and philosophic bases of support are evident in some of the reasons for undertaking interinstitutional programs reported in the literature, published and unpublished, on this subject.

In those instances where cooperative programs between colleges and universities have been undertaken in the past, some of the following reasons have been set forth in support of these arrangements:

1. Interinstitutional cooperation, without limiting the independence of individual institutions, tends to promote the more effective and efficient utilization of limited or specialized resources.

2. Interinstitutional cooperation, without requiring expansion of offerings, makes it possible for a college or university to enrich those programs which might otherwise lack luster, challenge, or the opportunity for broad educational experiences.

3. Interinstitutional cooperation, without impinging on institutional budgetary affairs, can actually result in definite savings or at least promote the possibility of economies in future operational costs.

4. Interinstitutional cooperation, without restricting a college's area of influence, allows a group of colleges to expand their community service projects and thereby enhance their respective offerings.

5. Interinstitutional cooperation, without force or coercion, is capable of producing academic and cultural stimulation to the entire institutional program. As a result of this approach to problems, students, faculty, and administrators will have access to hitherto unused resources for increasing intellectual growth.

Summary and Conclusions

The continued and rapid growth in college and university enrollments, the limitation in the amount of available financial resources, and the shortage of properly trained faculty personnel, together with other factors, are making it increasingly necessary for serious consideration to be given to every feasible means of securing adequate faculties, facilities, and programs for higher education.

Many possibilities have been suggested in this regard; some have obvious merit; some do not. When the question is asked, "What does a college or university need to increase its effectiveness in meeting the pressure of rising enrollments in the years ahead?" most replies center on one of the following: (1) additional financial resources; (2) expanded teaching space; (3) increased numbers of faculty; (4) improved planning; and (5) newer educational methods. One of the possible answers to this question is that of *interinstitutional cooperation.*

Interinstitutional cooperation provides direct meaning to responses 4 and 5 above and is indirectly related to the other three responses given. Through the use of this technique, a number of colleges and universities, both public and private, have agreed upon and carried forward joint or cooperative programs which have been reported as providing mutual advantages in the use of human and material resources for educational service to the institutions involved.

[7] Carroll Hanson. The Strangers in Your Midst. *Pride,* November 1959, p. 11.

CHAPTER II

Interinstitutional Cooperation at Local, State, and Regional Levels

THE RECORD of efforts among colleges and universities to work jointly and cooperatively toward mutually agreeable goals, from the earliest surveys and studies of the subject to the present, shows a growing support for such practices. Moreover, the duration of existence of some of the programs and projects noted in the earliest studies mentioned in chapter I attests to the merit and success of these interinstitutional actions. Some of the projects reported in the 1934 Sanford study are still in operation—over a quarter of a century later. Ertell, in his 1957 study, after pointing out that there was a "more than adequate" already existing number of cooperative projects to demonstrate the values of interinstitutional actions, further observes that "what appears now to be needed is a willingness and a desire on the part of administrators and faculty members to move gradually but with persistence toward the development of cooperative relationships." [1]

In this chapter are described 29 cooperative arrangements in higher education; some of these were established nearly 2 decades ago, while others are of relatively recent origin.[2] Twenty-four are State and local area programs and 5 are interstate regional programs. No attempt is made to present these examples in a strict sequence chronologically, for it is the feeling of the authors that the date of beginning is much less significant than the fact of success in the cooperative venture, which is evidenced by the continuation of the program. Where beginning dates have been reported in the literature, they have also been included in this delineation in order to provide some perspective.

The attention of the reader is directed to the array of items covered in cooperative arrangements currently in force among the colleges and universities of this country. Such programs include the exchange or joint use of personnel, physical facilities, academic programs, and administrative relationships.

1. *Personnel:* Cooperative arrangements involving personnel may include, individually or collectively, administration, faculty, students, operating and maintenance persons, and visiting personnel, such as artists, musicians, and lecturers.

2. *Physical facilities:* In this category are included arrangements for the cooperative utilization of such specialized facilities as libraries, laboratories, gymnasiums, and field houses; of certain types of expensive equipment; and of major specific use facilities, such as observatories, which are not a part of any specific higher education institution.

3. *Academic programs:* Interinstitutional arrangements involving curricular programs cover, in the aggregate, a broad range of undergraduate, graduate, and combination offerings, such as the "3–2" two-degree program.

4. *Administrative relationships:* In this area are found such varied cooperative arrangements as those for research, use of the cultural resources of an area, purchasing, and scheduling.

Specific plans, programs, arrangements, and agreements representative of interinstitutional cooperation in higher education are reported below.

[1] Merton W. Ertell. *Interinstitutional Cooperation in Higher Education.* Albany, N.Y.: New York State Education Department, 1957. p. 10.

[2] Several reasons exist for avoiding the attempt to make this list and presentation exhaustive. The number, scope, and variety of programs in effect together present a formidable barrier to such an effort. This is strengthened by the fugitive and incomplete nature of reporting of these projects. Finally, limitation of time and space for this bulletin made it impractical.

Bilateral Cooperation: State and Local Levels

The first group of State and local area cooperative arrangements delineated includes agreements between two higher education institutions or between one such institution and another agency.

Earlham College—Indiana University

During the years 1942–45, Earlham College and Indiana University cooperatively offered evening courses for adults in Richmond, Ind. College level courses were made available jointly by the two institutions as a part of the War Manpower Program. As a result of the acceptance of this earlier program, the Earlham College—Indiana University Center was established to continue the offering of collegiate level courses for adults in the evening hours.

Credits earned at the Center are accepted and recorded at both institutions. Faculty come from either college, neighboring colleges, or from the community.

As a part of its cooperative effort, the Center also acts as agent for Purdue University and American Institute of Banking courses and is also a joint sponsor of the Audubon Screen Tour.

In the initial stages of this arrangement, a contract was drawn whereby Indiana University paid a cash subsidy equal to the cost of rent on building and library facilities and institutional services which would be supplied by Earlham College. With these funds the salary of the director and clerical staff were paid and funds were allowed for promotion of the center program. Tuition charges pay for instruction costs. Any surplus which accrues is divided between the two cooperating institutions.

One may ask, "Can this arrangement be successful elsewhere?" In the words of the director of the Center, writing in 1957, "The 11-year experience of the Earlham College—Indiana University Center indicates that such an arrangement could be worked out in many other localities. . . . The chief requirement is a spirit of mutual trust and genuine desire to meet community needs." [3]

[3] *Case Book: Education Beyond the High School.* Washington: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. November 1957.

Flint Junior College—The University of Michigan

An example of how higher education, through the cooperative efforts of a State university and a community college, can be made available to those who might not otherwise be able to further their education beyond high school is found in Flint, Mich. Here are located two institutions which are administratively and financially independent and autonomous—the Flint College of the University of Michigan and Flint Junior College. The former, controlled by the University of Michigan, offers upper-division courses only; the latter is a comprehensive 2-year community college under the control of the city board of education. Here are combined some of the most advantageous features of joint local and State planning, by means of which available financial and educational resources are effectively employed to provide both junior college and senior college programs. Through appropriate administrative arrangements, the two institutions make end-of-semester reimbursement to each other for educational services rendered to cross-over students.[4]

Students are permitted to register in lower- and upper-division programs in both colleges at the same time without being registered in both institutions simultaneously. In this program, some physical facilities are shared; a librarian handles the details for both libraries; provision is made for interchange of faculty; and the costs of certain specialized services are shared. Audiovisual services are provided by the junior college, for which the university is charged a part of the total cost.

This program has been in effect since September 1956, when the Flint College of the University of Michigan was established. No date has been set for termination of the program; as long as such a program is advantageous to the community, it is expected to continue in operation. A formal written agreement setting forth the policies and procedures governing the joint use of buildings and grounds, faculty, teaching equipment, and supplies was entered into in 1959 by the Flint

[4] Clyde E. Blocker. A Cooperative Experiment in Higher Education. *Higher Education,* 14: 11 and 13, September 1957.

Board of Education and the Regents of the University of Michigan.

One of the administrative officers concerned has stated his belief that the program of cooperation is sound educationally and also, he believes, incorporates the best of State and local administrative finance and control.

Harvard University—Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Harvard University and Massachusetts Institute of Technology have in operation an arrangement whereby graduate students of either institution may, with permission, take work from the other school without paying additional tuition. Under the plan, a student at Harvard who is engaged in full-time graduate study or in a combination of study and academic staff duties equivalent to full-time status, may register for courses at M.I.T. which are unavailable at his own college, provided the enrollment does not exceed one-half of the student's total registration for a term. M.I.T. students may also enroll at Radcliffe College under the same agreement. The only restriction placed upon students in this cooperative cross-enrollment plan lies in the reasonable stipulation that students are not allowed to attend classes which may be so crowded by additional outside registrations as to place an undue load on any instructor.

Two more formalized cooperative programs sponsored by Harvard and M.I.T. are: (1) The Cambridge Electron Accelerator, a multi-billion-volt accelerator constructed on property owned by Harvard but staffed cooperatively by both institutions. The accelerator operates under an agreement approved by the Atomic Energy Commission and the National Science Foundation, which are providing subsidies. (2) The M.I.T.—Harvard Joint Center for Urban Studies, which represents the combined efforts of the institutions directed toward urban affairs and related fields (for example, architecture, public administration, government, public health, economics, industrial management, and social relations).

Lowell Technological Institute—Massachusetts Institute of Technology

These two institutions are joined in an informal cooperative program of textile technology which permits the exchange of student enrollees, interchange of faculty, and mutual use of specialized equipment and material. This cooperative arrangement includes:

1. Mutual use of the manufacturing and research facilities of Lowell Technological Institute by both graduate and undergraduate students of Massachusetts Institute of Technology who are working on theses, and the use of M.I.T. textile facilities for the development of graduate theses by Lowell students;

2. Mutual use of the books, periodicals, and graduate theses of both institutional libraries by students of the cooperating schools;

3. Opportunity for students of L.T.I. to obtain additional chemistry, mathematics, business, engineering, and textile technology work at M.I.T. Students at M.I.T. are able to work with textile-manufacturing and finishing machinery for cotton, wool, and rayon at Lowell during summer sessions and as such special courses are made available;

4. Joint seminars between the students of both colleges; interchange of faculty members for special lecture and demonstration purposes.

This program has been successfully operating for more than 10 years and shows every sign of continuing as a cooperative endeavor in the years ahead. There is no formal contractual arrangement and no financial commitment on the part of either institution.

Ohio State University Cooperative Agreements

In cooperation with several other schools and colleges, Ohio State University maintains agreements for graduate program enrichment. Some of the cooperating institutions are: the Merrill-Palmer School, with a Master's program; the Juvenile Diagnostic Center of the State of Ohio, with work in clinical psychology; the Battelle Memorial Institute, with programs in fields of engineering; the Kettering Research Foundation, with studies of prenatal and postnatal environments; and the University of Cincinnati, with plans of study in social administration.

In addition to these agreements, Ohio State University and Ohio Wesleyan University cooperatively administer and maintain the Perkins Observatory. As a result of this arrangement, facilities are made available to students having an

interest in research work in the fields of astronomy and astrophysics. Also, members of the Observatory scientific staff serve as members of the Physics and Astronomy Department at Ohio State University.

One of the most recent announcements of interinstitutional cooperation made by Ohio State University concerns a cooperative Ph.D. program with Miami University, at Oxford, Ohio. A memorandum of agreement between the two institutions provides for graduate students in certain areas of study to complete approximately one-half of their requirements at Miami. The degree will be awarded by Ohio State "in cooperation with Miami University" when all requirements have been completed.

The agreement provides for programs in chemistry, physics, education, English, and history. The program will operate under a joint committee of six, composed of three members from each university. Residence at Miami will be considered as residence at Ohio State. Students will be encouraged to use the research facilities at Miami University and to prepare the dissertation with a Miami faculty member.

In the announcement of the program, these reasons were cited for adoption of the plan:

> 1. To maintain and advance the quality of graduate study for the doctorate in Ohio;
>
> 2. To avoid duplication at both institutions of specialized facilities and other "extraordinary expense" usually found in graduate education.

Thus these two Ohio universities have joined forces to provide enrichment and improve quality in the important area of doctoral study.

Wells College—Cornell University

In 1955 a cooperatively planned program of preparation for high school teachers was established by Wells College and Cornell University in New York State. The motivation behind the development of this program lay in the need of Wells, a small liberal arts college, for a program of professional education courses for its prospective teacher education students. Rather than embark on the development of a broadly conceived department of education, an agreement was established with Cornell to provide some of the necessary course offerings for certification in the State, which Wells felt unable to offer. As a result of this plan, Wells College offered its students 12 of the required 18 hours and Cornell University supplied instruction for the remaining 6 necessary credits.

Within the 6 credit-hour offering of Cornell were included general principles of teaching, special methods of teaching subjects where certification is needed, observation, and, most important, student teaching. In its initial stages of development, needed changes in the program were noted and instituted. The cooperative nature of the undertaking proved to be the real value of the program.

Arrangements for observation and student teaching, selection of special methods instructors, the teaching of general methods, and the guidance of student teachers were the responsibility of the director of the program, who was accountable to both institutions. The matter of transportation of students during periods of observation and student teaching was assigned to the Wells College staff.

The course work for the program was conducted under the sponsorship of the Cornell University School of Education, as an off-campus offering under the jurisdiction of the Extramural Division of Cornell University. Classroom space for course work in general and special methods, and for individual counseling and guidance in student teaching was provided by Wells College.

In 1960, when Wells College assumed direction of its own teacher training program, the cooperative arrangement with Cornell University was terminated. This was considered to be a desirable and hoped-for result of the project.

Williams College—Sprague Electric Company

A college and an industrial firm in Massachusetts have embarked upon a cooperative plan for supplementing the college's teaching resources in the critical fields of physics and chemistry. Under an agreement with Sprague Electric Company of North Adams, Williams College in Williamstown (5 miles distant) offers a master of arts program in physics and chemistry to which Sprague contributes funds, students, and teaching personnel.

Sprague was interested in the master of arts program at Williams as a means of upgrading personnel and as an incentive for recruiting new employees in scientific fields. Since Williams had the program but lacked sufficient teaching personnel to expand the offering to meet the need in the area, Sprague also indicated a willingness to allow scientists acceptable to Williams to serve as faculty in the graduate program. From this beginning Sprague has also agreed for certain of its staff to participate in the teaching of undergraduate laboratory sections of freshmen and sophomores during the day.

In the final agreement, 12 of the Sprague Electric Company scientists (6 in physics, 6 in chemistry) were given released time from their positions to supplement the teaching faculty at Williams College. The scientists so employed continue to receive full salary from Sprague and are in addition reimbursed by Williams as an incentive for the extra time and effort involved in class preparations, grading, and report reading.

Students from Sprague enrolled in the M.A. program are also given released time from their employment duties to pursue additional study with regular Williams College faculty, but are not additionally permitted to teach in the undergraduate laboratory program.

The guiding philosophy of this cooperative agreement is contained in the following statement by Prof. Ralph Winch of the Physics Department at Williams in his report on the program:

> Industry and government have attracted many of the scientists who might otherwise be teaching, hence the extra teachers needed to meet the Nation's demand for scientists must come from these two areas. Many industrial concerns, conscious of their responsibilities to education, are making financial contributions. But money is not enough. A supply of trained personnel must be available [to colleges] during the day when most undergraduate instruction is given.[5]

Under the terms of an informal written agreement, Sprague Electric pays the instructional costs, beyond those costs which the college would have in any event, for company personnel who are pursuing the graduate program. The amount paid by the company for this purpose represents only a part of the total cost to the company, which, as mentioned earlier, also has the released-time cost for its personnel taking the graduate program as well as for those engaged in teaching at Williams.

This program, which has now been in operation for some 3 or 4 years, is scheduled, under the terms of the 1960 contract renewal, to continue through fiscal 1964. However, if the need continues to exist, it is anticipated that the program will be extended beyond that time.

The Chairman of the Board of Sprague Electric and the President of Williams College are charged with overall administration of the program. Responsibility for the day-to-day administration is assigned to company personnel and to the college's Committee on Graduate Study.

Multilateral Cooperation: State and Local Levels

In the descriptions previously presented, the cooperative arrangements concerned two agencies only. State and local area cooperative efforts involving more than two agencies follow:

Amherst, Mount Holyoke, Smith, and University of Massachusetts

Four colleges in the Amherst, Mass., area are joined in a voluntary program of interinstitutional cooperation. Under this plan, advanced students from any of the four institutions—Amherst, Mount Holyoke, Smith, or the University of Massachusetts—may enroll in courses at any of the member institutions for work which is unavailable at their own college. In certain specialized areas, faculties are exchanged between institutions, and some arrangements for dual appointments are also in effect. Continuous studies of significant ways and means to increase the opportunities for partnership are in progress and are reported upon (and instituted, if feasible) from time to time. The major purpose of this cooperative plan has been stated as a means of enlarging and enriching the educational opportunities for the students of this four-college area.

The development of this cooperative association was reported in March 1960 as follows:

[5] *Case Book: Education Beyond the High School.* Washington: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. Vol. 1, Case No. 14, Apr. 1, 1958.

Four neighboring institutions of higher education in Massachusetts: Amherst, Mount Holyoke, and Smith Colleges and the University of Massachusetts, have established a joint clearinghouse to recruit and furnish teaching assistants to their faculties. The assistants are drawn from a pool made up primarily of women college graduates who are married, have children and can work only part-time. The four institutions agreed to initiate this plan on a trial basis after a questionnaire sent to 1,165 women in Amherst, Northampton, Holyoke, and other neighboring cities and towns revealed that many of these women had advanced degrees and past teaching experience and were available to work part-time.[4]

Following a recent study by a joint committee from the four institutions, a proposal was made to create a "new college" in the general area of the existing institutions, to which they might contribute and with which they might develop new departures in educational methods and techniques. The study was financed by a grant from the Fund for the Advancement of Education.

The principal administrative officer of this cooperative program—the Coordinator—encourages and coordinates the detailed work of planning and executing the various projects. He is charged with handling problems of schedules, transportation, payments of tuition fees, salaries, and other matters. Meetings of the four Presidents and the Coordinator are held at least three times a year. In addition, four presidential Deputies have been appointed to assist the Coordinator in connection with various projects and activities. The Coordinator is an appointee of all four Presidents and is listed among the administrative officers of each institution in its official catalog.

Officially, this cooperative program has been in effect since February 1957; however, the Hampshire Inter-Library Center, which has provided the four institutions with comprehensive library facilities, was in operation 5 or 6 years earlier. The Library Center project and a cooperative FM Radio Station project, have been set up as legal entities with boards of control in which membership is shared equally by the four institutions. Other cooperative arrangements have been largely verbal.

Those activities which have proved their usefulness have been fostered; those which have not proved their merit have been cancelled. Some projects, on the basis of experience, have been reduced in size; others are still on an experimental basis.

With one or two exceptions, all expenses, such as the salary of the Coordinator, expenses of his office, and other items are shared equally by the four institutions. A salary scale has been established for instructors teaching on another campus. For each student taking a course on another campus, each institution pays its proportionate share of the tuition fee. A budget has been established which covers travel expenses of the Coordinator and other costs incidental to the various meetings of Deans, Registrars, and Deputies which he attends. The projects administered under boards of control have necessitated actual cash contributions from the institutions under arrangements which have been carefully worked out.

Bryn Mawr, Haverford, and Swarthmore

For several years, cooperative arrangements have existed among three colleges in Pennsylvania: Bryn Mawr, Haverford, and Swarthmore. One such arrangement provides for the temporary loan or exchange of faculty members. Under this plan, the borrowing institution pays the loaned or exchanged faculty member directly for his services. In addition to the faculty exchange, there are also some joint appointments of faculty in such specialized fields as music, medieval history, and Russian studies.

The three colleges also share in some common student activities, such as joint sponsorship of student experiences in mental hospitals and a work camp in Mexico. Students are exchanged between the cooperating colleges for certain specialized course work.

Other phases of the arrangements include meetings of the three college presidents every 3 or 4 weeks for discussion of common problems. A joint faculty committee supervises an exchange of books program, specialization in collections agreement, and the listing of library holdings in the card catalogs of each of the college libraries.

While the cooperation between the colleges is real, it is more largely a matter of sharing com-

[4] *Toward Higher Education.* Trenton, N.J.: New Jersey State Department of Education. Vol. 1, p. 1–4, March 1960.

mon concerns than of administrative structures and binding agreements. The arrangement is entirely informal in nature, the periodic meeting of the presidents of the three institutions being the only regular feature.

Claremont Graduate School

Originally organized as the Associated Colleges at Claremont in California, this cooperative institution is now incorporated as Claremont College. In this endeavor five colleges—Claremont, Claremont Men's, Harvey Mudd, Pomona, and Scripps—adjacent to each other in a small community, maintain a sixth agency, Claremont Graduate School. This institution plays a dual role. It has personnel of its own and draws in addition upon the faculty of the other five units for its program. It also administers a large auditorium, a library, and a common business management service. The five colleges also conduct some direct interchange of faculty and have some joint appointments of faculty. The program of the combined school is administered by a board which includes, as ex-officio members, the college presidents, each one of whom presides as provost for a term of 1 year in turn.

Intercollegiate Program of Graduate Studies in the Humanities and Social Sciences

Seven southern California colleges, in order to improve college teaching, have joined in a cooperative program of graduate studies in the humanities and social sciences. The seven independent, accredited, liberal arts institutions participating in this program are located within 35 miles of a common geographical center and in an area where the maximum distance between the two most distant colleges is 65 miles.

Through the cooperative use of the facilities and faculties of Claremont Graduate School, Claremont Men's, Occidental, Pomona, Scripps, and Whittier Colleges and the University of Redlands, these institutions have been able to combine some of the advantages which size gives to a large university with some of the assets of small liberal arts colleges. Students in the program are also within relative proximity to the Huntington Library and Art Gallery of San Marino, which contains several fine research collections in the humanities and social sciences.

In their programs, students take part in inter-subject seminars, field seminars, tutorials, colloquia, and internships to provide breadth and emphasis to their studies. Special programs are offered at the member institution best suited to the purpose.

Degrees are granted by one of the participating colleges upon recommendation of the Educational Council of the Intercollegiate Program. Each student takes his degree with the institution of his choice; however, during his program he may take work at any of the other partnership colleges.

The program has been operating in its present form since 1955. Prior to 1955, a 2-year experimental program and a 2-year exploratory program had been in effect, supported by the Fund for the Advancement of Education. The program still receives some financial assistance from this agency, and from other foundations, chiefly for support of fellowships.

The contractual arrangements which structure this project are found chiefly in the correspondence carried on between the presidents of the several institutions and ratified by the respective boards. No specific time of duration of the project has been established.

Administrative arrangements for the program are quite simple. Exercising overall supervision is the Administrative Committee, consisting of the presidents of the several institutions. The actual work of planning curricular programs, selecting personnel, and choosing scholars and fellows is carried out by the Educational Council, consisting of representatives from each of the participating institutions. One of these Council representatives serves as Executive Director.

Financial commitments to the program by the several institutions involve the cost of utilization of faculty for inter-subject and special seminars offered in the approved curricular fields.

Harrisburg Area Center for Higher Education

A determination by Lebanon Valley College and Elizabethtown College to provide the Harrisburg area with improved and enriched higher

education opportunities for more students, through pooling of resources and coordination of efforts, led, in 1951, to the establishment of the Harrisburg Area Center for Higher Education. To achieve their objective, the two institutions agreed to form a relatively simple administrative arrangement.

A committee consisting of the presidents, the deans, and the treasurers of the two colleges was charged with the administration of the Center. In the division of administrative responsibility, the presidents alternated in chairing the committee, while the deans and treasurers handled matters concerned with instruction, collection of fees, promotion, and finance.

A third institution, Temple University in Philadelphia, joined this cooperative arrangement in the academic year 1954–55, while a fourth member, the Pennsylvania State University, was added to the program in 1957–58. The addition of these two new members enabled the Center to offer more varied educational opportunities, including graduate work in a number of fields.

In the fall of 1958, a fifth institution, the University of Pennsylvania, voted to enter into cooperative arrangement with the other institutions, and joined with them in filing an application for a charter, which was granted by the County Court; on December 16, 1958, the Center was formally incorporated. As stated in the application for charter, the purpose of the Center is "to supply a means of bringing college educational programs to the Harrisburg, Pa., area, at the undergraduate and graduate levels, designed to meet the academic, vocational, and cultural needs of persons residing in Central Pennsylvania." The corporation's charter makes provision for a board of directors consisting of 2 persons from each of the 5 institutions and 11 community representatives. The chief administrative officer of the Center, who carries the title of dean, oversees the management of the program of the Center in keeping with the basic policies determined by the board of directors.[7] Day-to-day conduct of the Center is in the hands of an administrative and curriculum committee, composed of the Dean and Business Manager of the Center, a representative of each of the participating institutions, and 3 community members.

Among the principal features of the cooperative program of the Center are: the publication of a joint catalog containing titles and numbers of courses offered at the two colleges; application of credits earned at the Center toward a degree at either college; agreement upon a uniform tuition fee for all courses offered (although the same tuition fee was not charged on their own campuses); late afternoon and evening classes held in the local high schools; faculty for the Center drawn almost entirely from the staffs of the two institutions; and a uniform salary scale.

From the outset of the Center's establishment, the participating institutions have assumed the responsibility for the cost of operation. No financial assistance is received from the community, nor are any endowment funds available. The budget is prorated among the cooperating institutions on the basis of institutional enrollments. Instructional salaries and expenses are the responsibility of each institution. Tuition collections for the institutions are made by the Center.

During 1951–52, the beginning year of the cooperative Center, 171 separate course registrations were recorded; by 1958–59 this figure had risen to a total of 1,227 registrations.

In support of this type of interinstitutional cooperative endeavor, President Baugher of Elizabethtown College closed with this statement in his report:

> It is our conviction that our American educational system has the obligation to identify and develop the human resources of the nation—resources which are frequently hidden. In order to meet the educational needs of the community, it seems entirely consistent with the principles of sound economy and good educational administration to bring existing facilities and services together through a program such as that of the Harrisburg Area Center for Higher Education in which the cooperating colleges and universities can pool their strengths and enrich their curriculums while maintaining their separate identities.[8]

Temple University Cooperative Project in Teacher Education

In June 1954, Temple University was awarded a grant from the Fund for the Advancement of

[7] A. C. Baugher. Harrisburg Area Center for Higher Education: Its Background and Program. *Journal of Higher Education.* 30:27–30, January 1959.

[8] Ibid., p. 30.

Education (Ford Foundation) for the purpose of establishing two experimental programs in teacher education. These would constitute (1) a post-baccalaureate general education program of such a nature as best to enable those pursuing it to keep abreast of rapid social changes, and (2) a post-baccalaureate internship program. The first of these programs is described below. Five Pennsylvania colleges in the same general geographic area—none of which offer work leading to graduate degrees—were cooperatively involved with Temple University in this program. Two of these five institutions had previously cooperated with Temple University in bringing to their campuses graduate programs under the auspices of the University. The five colleges were: Albright College, Reading; Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster; Lebanon Valley College, Annville; Muhlenberg College, Allentown; and Ursinus College, Collegeville.

The program was headed by a Director, who had had previous experience in working with college faculty members in curriculum development. A Board of Control of 14 members was established, consisting of 12 representatives from the participating institutions, one representative from the Pennsylvania Department of Public Instruction, and one representative from the Pennsylvania Association of Colleges and Universities. The Director acted as Secretary to the Board.

A period of 1 year was devoted to planning for the experimental program in general education, and a Planning Committee composed of representatives from the cooperating institutions was set up for this purpose. The Planning Committee was selected on the basis of recommendations made by the heads of the 6 institutions. During this 1-year period, courses were developed in the humanities, social science, and natural science areas. These graduate-level courses were offered at 3 centers over a 3-year period; classes met on Saturday mornings for 3 hours. The student clientele for the courses consisted of 160 elementary and secondary school teachers representing a cross-section as to age, sex, marital status, cultural background, undergraduate education, teaching background, and general ability. A "cooperating" instructional staff from the 6 institutions was established, from which the teaching personnel for the courses were drawn.

At the end of the 3-year period of experimentation, an evaluation of the program was made, on the basis of: (1) student retention in the program; (2) objective test scores; (3) reaction of instructional staff; (4) student reaction; and (5) reaction of outside evaluators.

The published report of Pilot Study I of this program reflects throughout "the values that can come to institutions when they work together in the exploration and advancement of new programs. Through these relationships faculty members have been encouraged to attack other instructional and curricular problems on their respective campuses, communities have recognized the desire of institutions to share their resources with others to meet local needs, and faculties and administrations gained strength, encouragement, and direction in their association with neighboring institutions that otherwise might not have been realized."[9]

Indiana Conference on Higher Education

Faced with the problem of increased veteran enrollments following World War II, 26 private and 4 public college and university presidents met in 1945 and formed the Indiana Conference on Higher Education. Through this medium of cooperation, these 30 institutions made plans for the study and resolution of mutual problems. As a result of their efforts, many joint studies have been undertaken which have pointed up the direction in which higher education should proceed.

This Conference has been united following joint discussion of such public interest issues as universal military training, the roles of private and public supported education, the function of higher education, educational television, general education, scholarships, and even the social and philosophical principles of higher education.

> Through voluntary co-operation, these 30 institutions of higher education have been able to plan together for the future of higher education in Indiana. The solution of these problems will not be met by "crash" programs hurriedly conceived and executed.

[9] *General Education for Teachers* (Pilot Study I of an Experimental Program in Teacher Education, Joseph S. Butterweck, Director). Philadelphia: Temple University [Undated], p. 3.

but rather through sensible long-range planning. It has been this type of voluntary cooperation that has made the Indiana Conference on Higher Education an integral part of the higher education system in Indiana.[10]

A cooperative study is currently being made to determine the background characteristics of students attending post-high-school institutions in Indiana, the findings to be used as a basis for future planning for higher education in Indiana. This study, designed to supplement previous cooperative studies of the Indiana Conference on Higher Education, is being carried out with the assistance of Indiana University, the Indiana Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, and the Indiana Association of Junior and Senior High School Principals.

Lowell Institute Cooperative Broadcasting Council

Twelve cultural and educational organizations, members of the Lowell Institute Cooperative Broadcasting Council, co-sponsor the national award-winning education radio station WGBH-FM and pioneer educational television station WGBH-TV, Channel 2, in Boston, Mass. The Council, organized under the leadership of the Trustee of the Lowell Institute, was established in 1946 by the presidents of Boston College, Boston University, Harvard University, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Northeastern University, and Tufts College. The original aim of the Council was to develop continuing series of radio programs in the adult education field from among the resources and faculties of its members. This objective has been considerably broadened in scope in the 15 years since the establishment of the Council.

The cooperating institutions include Boston College; the Boston Symphony Orchestra; Boston University; Brandeis University; Harvard University; Lowell Institute; Massachusetts Institute of Technology; the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston; the Museum of Science, Boston; the New England Conservatory of Music, Northeastern University; and Tufts University. Each of the educational institutions in the group makes teaching facilities available to the FM and TV stations.

Through these two stations for radio and television, each of the cooperating organizations is able to extend its resources and educational facilities and concepts beyond the confines of their particular environment in the Greater Boston area.

Funds for the erection of the television station were donated to the Council in honor of Edward A. and Lincoln Filene (former prominent Boston retailers) and by the Twentieth Century Fund and the Fund for Adult Education. Both stations are owned by the WGBH Educational Foundation, a Massachusetts non-profit corporation, and are operated with funds contributed by friends and by the 12 Council member organizations. While the Foundation operates with the advice and cooperation of the Lowell Institute Cooperative Broadcasting Council, there is no contractual arrangement between the two organizations.

Station WGBH-FM provides late afternoon and evening schedules of educational, informational, and cultural broadcasts, including news and news analysis; serious drama; collegiate courses; symphonic, instrumental, and vocal music; poetry; children's programs; public affairs discussions and documentaries; and lecture series on history, the arts and letters, and the social sciences. Programs are developed with members of each institution's faculties and staff. Through the Radio Network of the National Association of Educational Broadcasters, these programs have been extended to millions of listeners throughout the United States.

Educational series from other sources are also broadcast regularly over station WGBH-FM. These sources include: British Broadcasting Corporation; Radiodiffusion-Télévision Français; Canadian Broadcasting Corporation; and the radio-broadcasting systems of Japan, Italy, the Netherlands, Germany, and others. A number of the Council's programs are prepared for worldwide broadcast through the facilities of the Voice of America.

Station WGBH-TV presents afternoon and evening programs which include adult and child education, news and news analysis, discussion of

[10] Raymond S. Butler. Interinstitutional Cooperation in Higher Education. *School and Society* 87:44–47, Jan. 31, 1959.

civic affairs, music, the arts, and adult entertainment. As in the case of the radio broadcast programs, the television programs also originate largely from the members of the Council.

Another aspect of the cooperative WGBH-TV program is an in-school telecasting service provided by the 21″ Classroom, an organization consisting of and financed by over 150 member school systems in Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Hampshire, and Connecticut. Programs for the 21″ Classroom project are produced by WGBH-TV and are used each week by over 1,200 elementary schools, 125 junior high schools, and 230 senior high schools. Programs currently being produced reinforce material taught in the fields of physical science, natural science, literature, music, French, and world affairs.

Members of the Council keep in contact with WGBH-FM and WGBH-TV through coordinators from their officers or staff. Station operations are reviewed annually at a meeting of the presidents of the member institutions.

The following constitute the present officers of the WGBH Educational Foundation: Trustee of the Lowell Institute; President of Harvard University; President of Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Treasurer of Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Treasurer of Harvard University; Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Boston Symphony Orchestra, Inc.; General Manager of WGBH-FM and WGBH-TV; and a Trustee of the Twentieth Century Fund.

Minnesota Intercollege Cooperative Project

The January 26, 1952, issue of *School and Society* contained an account of a cooperative arrangement between five Minnesota higher institutions: Carleton College, Gustavus Adolphus College, Hamline University, Macalester College, and St. Olaf College, which had effected an arrangement to "[bring] to each campus an outstanding creative scholar in a special field of knowledge who can serve the intellectual interests of the students, faculty, and community." [11]

The initiation of the program was made possible by a grant of funds from Louis W. and Maud Hill Family Foundation, which was to be spread over the first 3 years of operation. A portion of the funds was designated for Central Planning Committee operation and support of joint conferences between the five colleges.

In a joint release by two of the officers of the group announcing the grant, the following testimonial to cooperative effort was stated:

> The fact that five autonomous liberal arts colleges are united in this endeavor is in itself significant. The experiences that the five faculties have already had in the exchange of views have been stimulating. At a time when cultural values are so often subordinated to immediate and practical needs even in education it is a source of great encouragement to those who believe in the basic educational values of liberal arts culture that the Hill Family Foundation has both recognized the purposes of the cooperating colleges and challenged them to even higher endeavors.[12]

This cooperative project was terminated in 1958, after some 6 years of successful operation. Two of the five institutions—Carleton and St. Olaf—are now participating in the Associated Colleges of the Midwest cooperative program reported later in this chapter.

The University Center in Nashville

In Nashville, Tenn., three adjacent institutions of higher learning have been cooperating in an arrangement for expanding the resources of each. Since the early 1930's, George Peabody College, Scaritt College, and Vanderbilt University have been engaged in a program of mutual sharing of facilities and resources, while at the same time remaining independent in organization and administration. A student may register at any one of the three cooperating colleges and obtain courses which fit into his program at the other two institutions.

At the graduate level, a cooperative arrangement between Vanderbilt and Peabody, adopted in 1936, provides that a Master's degree or Doctor's degree candidate shall take his major and write his thesis at the institution from which he chooses to graduate and that he must satisfy all

[11] *School and Society*, Jan. 26, 1952. p. 61.

[12] Charles J. Turck, President, Macalester College, and Frank R. Kille, Dean, Carleton College (reported in *School and Society*, Jan. 26, 1952. p. 62).

the requirements of that institution for such degree. He may be permitted to select work in the affiliated institution without restriction as to the number of hours; however, his work program for either degree must be approved by the major professor and the graduate dean in the institution from which the degree is to be secured.

Since 1936, these three institutions have developed a cooperative library facility—the Joint University Libraries project. To date, this library program has included: (1) the securing of funds with which to build a Joint University Library and for endowing its maintenance and service; (2) planning and construction of the building; (3) developing a plan of joint ownership and direction of the building and the library resources and facilities of the three cooperating institutions; and (4) the purchase of bibliographical aids.

Financial assistance on the joint library project was received from the General Education Board, which contributed $1,000,000; from the Carnegie Corporation, which contributed $250,000; and from more than 5,000 friends of the three institutions, who pledged an additional $750,000.

The Joint University Library is situated within easy access of the three institutions, at the point of intersection of the three campuses. A union card catalog is maintained by the Joint University Libraries. It covers books in the following institutional libraries: Public Library of Nashville; Fisk University; George Peabody College for Teachers; Meharry Medical College; Scarritt College; Tennessee State Library; medical and departmental libraries of Vanderbilt University; and the Joint University Library. As of May 1, 1960, book resources of the three cooperating institutions totaled 785,282 volumes, distributed as follows: Joint University Library, 395,578 volumes; College Library of George Peabody College, 209,022 volumes; Peabody Demonstration School Libraries, 12,930 volumes; Departmental and Professional School Libraries of Vanderbilt University, 156,230 volumes; and Scarritt College Library, 11,522 volumes. In addition, there are many periodicals, microfilm materials, microcards, phonograph records, and related library items.

In addition to the three-college arrangement in the Nashville University Center, Peabody and Scarritt also cooperate with the University of Tennessee School of Social Work in a reciprocal program that allows students from the first two institutions to pursue work at the latter university as though they were regular enrollees at that institution.

Recently, cooperative efforts have been promoted between Vanderbilt, Peabody, and Scarritt and the City Government of Nashville to correlate expansion plans of the universities with general municipal improvements in the area, with the objective of establishing an urban renewal project. Fisk University, Tennessee Agricultural and Industrial State University, and Meharry Medical College, which form a second university center in Nashville, are cooperating with the Nashville City Government in a similar program. It is hoped to secure designation of these two areas by the Federal Urban Renewal Agency as urban renewal projects eligible for Federal assistance in underwriting the cost of the program.

Conservation Laboratory—Interuniversity Cooperation

In addition to the combined university cooperation of five State institutions, two departments of State government and a large number of private organizations join together each year in the conduct of the Ohio Conservation Laboratory. Beginning approximately 20 years ago, this program has proved to be a highly successful plan for conducting a conservation-education workshop.

Originally Ohio State University was the only collegiate institution in the program. Later, when it was believed practicable, the other four State universities were brought into the program. Under the plan, each of the five State universities lists the offerings of the conservation laboratory in its respective summer session catalogs. A student may register for the workshop at his own school and pay the regular registration fee. All students are taught together as one class, and grades are reported at the end of the session to each parent college registrar. All institutions cooperating in the program share the instructional costs and thereby provide an opportunity for education that each of them alone would not be able to offer.

Interinstitutional Program of Teaching by Television

This project represents perhaps the first attempt at utilizing television for simultaneous classroom instruction in higher education on an interinstitutional basis. In 1955, the proposal was submitted to the Fund for the Advancement of Education with a request for financial assistance to help support the experiment. A grant of $200,000 was subsequently made to the Oregon State System for Higher Education for experimentation in 1957–58 and 1958–59. This grant was matched by funds from the State Higher Education System.

A director was appointed for the project, and committees were established at each of the participating institutions to determine what course offerings might be presented by television. A project coordinator was employed to work with the different institutions in the selection of courses and to oversee the administrative and production aspects of the project. Other staff personnel included a research director, assigned to the project on a half-time basis, and reporting directly to the project director. Responsibility of the research director consisted of the planning, conducting, and analysis of the basic research required in connection with the project.

At the start of this experimental plan (1957) Oregon State College and the University of Oregon initiated their first two courses for broadcast over a closed-circuit television hook-up between six State-supported college and university campuses.

In 1957–58 these same two offerings, one in United States history and the other in elementary chemistry, were made available again. Also, the Schools of Education at the State College, the University, and the Oregon College of Education planned a 3-term series on basic education. One instructor from each institution was responsible for 1-term presentation.

In an effort to increase "face to face" contact and allow students the opportunity for questions, the professors visit each campus to meet with enrolled students. This feature is thought to be one of the major benefits of the plan.

Initially, a low-wattage educational television station was constructed to serve four participating colleges on open-circuit television. This group consisted of three State schools and a private institution—Willamette University.

During 1958–59, kinescopes were made available to the other three State colleges for use in similar course areas. Graduate and other offerings were planned for inclusion in the total program as soon as feasible.

In a statement on the applicability of this program to other institutions, Chancellor John R. Richards of the Oregon System of Higher Education has written:

> The importance of this project need not be stressed. The problem of increased enrollment and shortage of qualified faculty will soon affect all higher educational institutions. The program under way in the State of Oregon may point the way to interinstitutional cooperation as one means of solving the problem.[18]

On the basis of the 2-year period of experimentation, a tentative evaluation of the television project has been attempted, covering such areas as: feasibility of interinstitutional television instruction (technical, administrative, and financial); effectiveness of interinstitutional televised instruction (comparison of student achievement in televised and conventionally taught courses; comparison of student achievement in televised courses between classes at the originating and receiving institutions); and student and faculty attitude toward interinstitutional television instruction.

> In summary . . ., as a result of two years of experimentation in teaching of courses by television on an inter-institutional basis, it can be said that technically, operationally, and administratively such a program will work. Students will accept this method of teaching on much the same basis they accept conventional teaching, and televised instruction apparently does not legislate against them from an achievement point of view. Faculty members indicate some reluctance toward televised teaching but tend to agree that experimentation should be carried out in television to determine its potential as an educational tool. Current plans and commitments in Oregon will assure continued experimentation in inter-institutional television instruction for another three-year period to search out answers to certain

[18] An Inter-Institutional Program of Teaching by Television (Oregon System of Higher Education). *Case Book: Education Beyond the High School.* Washington: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. Vol. 1, Case No. 17, p. 1–2, Apr. 1, 1958.

questions raised through the operation of the program to date, and, to determine further the potential which television holds for the Oregon State System of Higher Education.[14]

The University Center in Virginia

In 1946, as a result of a grant from the General Education Board, the Richmond Area University Center was formed, with 9 area institutions as members. Since that time, 21 institutions have become affiliated in the effort and 4 other Virginia institutions have requested admission. The members of the University Center are: Bridgewater College, College of William and Mary, Hampden-Sydney College, Hampton Institute, Longwood College, Lynchburg College, Mary Baldwin College, Mary Washington College, Medical College of Virginia, Presbyterian School of Christian Education, Randolph-Macon College, Randolph-Macon Woman's College, Richmond Professional Institute, Sweet Briar College, Union Theological Seminary, University of Richmond, University of Virginia, Virginia Military Institute, Virginia State College, Virginia Union University, and Washington and Lee University. In 1958 the name of the Center was changed to the University Center in Virginia, Inc.

Programs currently operated through the Center are: Visiting Scholars Program, Visiting Scientists Program, Visiting Lecturers from Center Institutions, Cooperative Professors Program, Evening Courses for Adults, Cooperative Library Program, Faculty Research Grants, Center Film Library, and Center News Bulletin. Projected programs include: Pool of Portable Scientific Equipment, Cooperative Music Program, Portable Asian Studies Exhibits, and Glasgow House Conferences. Brief descriptions of selected projects of the Center follow:

Research.—Grants are made from a common pool of financial resources for the promotion and conduct of research by faculty members of the participating institutions.

Visiting Scholars.—By cooperatively scheduling visiting scholars for appearances at a number of institutions during a 2- or 3-week period, the quality and quantity of such programs has improved. Under this program a report in 1957 showed that 142 scholars had given 705 lectures since the advent of the program. In some specialized instances the speaker has been scheduled at Glasgow House, which is the Center's headquarters in Richmond, with interested students and faculty converging on the Center for a specific evening program.

Cooperative Professors.—To offer a broad choice of courses to all students, several joint appointments of faculty have been made to provide instruction in areas of education where the demand is small. In this way a college with limited funds is able to afford a portion of a specialist's time. By the use of this technique, all of the colleges are afforded an opportunity for curriculum enrichment.

Adult Education.—Through cooperation with the public schools, the colleges offer a coordinated program of adult education for the Richmond area. As a result, the area now enjoys the advantages of a program wherein each college limits its offerings to fields of strength, rather than providing an agglomeration of mediocre offerings presented in competition with other agencies. This coordination takes place through the services of the Center Council on Adult Education. Due to continued improvement in the quality of the program, the enrollment of adults in the various offerings more than doubled in the 7-year period from 1950 to 1957.

Library Affairs.—Early after the formation of the Center, one of the first programs embarked upon was one of library coordination. The success of this plan has been in the publication of a *Union List of Periodicals*, microfilming of certain local newspapers, the acquisition of 4,000 volumes of a research library, and various studies into feasible areas for future coordination.

Joint Film Library.—Upon the recommendation of a committee, a joint film library was established but did not appear to be too successful. The cost of operation was found to be greater than the income produced from rentals. A new approach to the matter of financing has been studied.

Survey of Humanities Courses.—A group was organized to investigate all courses in humanities being offered in the 4-year colleges and universi-

[14] Glenn Starlin and John E. Lallas, *Inter-Institutional Teaching by Television in the Oregon State System of Higher Education.* Eugene, Oreg., Oregon University Press, 1960. p. 69.

ties of Virginia. Certain recommendations were made for improvement of these offerings in member institutions.

Cooperative Use of Radio Station.—The gift of a well-equipped radio station to one of the participating colleges brought about a study and plan for cooperative use of these facilities.

Roster of Virginia-Born Professors.—Realizing that retired professors in other parts of the country who had been born in Virginia might return to that State to live, the Center staff has assembled a list of former professors. These teachers are encouraged to continue teaching part time in the institution of their choice among the Center members and thus provide a partial answer to the growing shortage of competent teaching personnel.

Area Calendar of Events.—Another Center activity involves the compilation of a master calendar of all cultural and educational events of a unique nature. In this way all students and faculty are apprised of the opportunities taking place in the Richmond area during a given period of time.

These are the programs of the Center to which effort has been directed. As the opportunity for further study is presented, it is expected that a broadening of the benefits of interinstitutional cooperation will be realized and the value of programs increased. Among the types of additional cooperative arrangements being investigated is the contemplated joint purchase of a nuclear reactor. Only through a program such as that conducted by the University Center would a purchase of this type be possible for most small colleges.

While the Center was initially supported by a foundation grant, the member institutions have more recently assumed the underwriting of the operating budget. Some of the specialized projects have become self-supporting, while foundation assistance continues to be a source of partial support for other projects. Each participating institution contributes annually to the support of the Center budget, in amounts ranging from $400 to $3,000, based on the size, ability, and extent of participation of the institution in the Center programs.

Applications for membership in the Center come before the Board of Directors. All agreements are informal, and no contracts are signed.

Staff personnel of the Center include an Administrator, an Assistant to the Administrator, a Secretary to the Administrator, a Film Librarian, and a Secretary and Bookkeeper. Committees composed of institutional representatives have a significant role in the operation of Center programs. These committees meet periodically in Richmond to transact any matters of business pertaining to the University Center which are of concern to them.

Plans call for the Center to continue in operation indefinitely.

University Center in Georgia

Some years ago several higher education institutions in the Atlanta, Ga., area conceived the idea of a cooperative undertaking. A program which looks forward to the eventual development of a university system based upon the plan successfully followed in Toronto, Canada, was instituted in 1938, and has made significant progress in this direction since that time. Participating institutions in the program are Emory University, Georgia Institute of Technology, the University of Georgia at Athens, Columbia Theological Seminary, Atlanta Art Association, Georgia State College of Business Administration, Oglethorpe University, and Agnes Scott College.

The governing body of the University Center is the Board of Trustees, which consists of 12 members: the presidents of the 8 member institutions, the Chancellor of the University System of Georgia, and 3 retired members.

Academic policy for the University Center is determined by the Council of Presidents, consisting of the eight presidents and Chancellor of the University System. The Council of Presidents has established the Advisory Faculty Council, consisting of faculty representatives from member institutions, as a means by which responsible faculty opinion may be secured on the desirability of academic proposals.

The Center currently employs three staff personnel: the Director, appointed by the Board of Trustees, on a one-third salary basis; the Union Catalog librarian, on a full-time basis; and a secretary, on a half-time basis. The librarian,

who is located at Emory University Library, employs several student assistants on a part-time basis.

While the University Center idea was proposed as early as 1930, it was not until 1938 that it actually came into being. The General Education Board made initial grants of $2,000,000 to Emory University and $500,000 to Agnes Scott College, institutions which lacked the tax resources of the State from which to draw support, that they might be equipped to do their part in the development of the Center.

Since 1938 sizable grants have been made directly to the University of Georgia and to Georgia Institute of Technology by the General Education Board. For the fiscal year 1961, the Center had a modest operating budget of $21,600, which was underwritten by the participating institutions, together with some support (6 percent) from outside sources.

Principal activities of the Center have included: research in the humanities, basic social sciences, and basic natural sciences; grants-in-aid to college professors for the purpose of improving classroom teaching; a visiting scholars program; a union catalog of 2,500,000 volumes; Atlanta area teacher education service; a joint program for training teachers of speech correction; establishment of a commission to study the teaching of English in Georgia; and interinstitutional agreements between member institutions of the Center. Besides the obvious tangible results of these programs, numerous benefits of an intangible nature have grown out of the activities promoted by the Center.

Three-College: 3-2 Program in Engineering

Progress Reports for March 1960 contained an announcement of a new cooperative venture among three North Carolina institutions of higher learning using an established program idea. Under the arrangement, Duke University, North Carolina State, and Methodist College (Fayetteville, N.C.) will coperate in a "3–2" program in engineering. Students who attend Methodist College for 3 years may then transfer to State or Duke for 2 years, earning a B.S. degree from Methodist College and an engineering degree from Duke or North Carolina State.[15]

The 3–2 program in engineering is a widely established cooperative arrangement in many areas and involves a great number of higher institutions. Duke University, for example, has such a program in effect, not only with Methodist College, but also with other institutions, in North Carolina, Washington, D.C., Illinois, Florida, Vermont, and South Carolina. The Methodist College project is reported as one of the most recently established arrangements. (Methodist College is a new institution, having begun operation in 1960.)

This type of program enables the student to combine with his engineering training an enlarged program of humanities and social studies. Moreover, he is afforded two undergraduate experiences, an opportunity to pursue the first part of his higher education in a liberal arts atmosphere, and a longer time in which to determine his particular area of specialization in engineering.

Western Reserve University, Case Institute of Technology, and the Cleveland Museum of Natural History

A recent issue of *Toward Higher Education*, a publication of the New Jersey State Department of Education, carried an announcement of a cooperative venture being entered into by three Ohio institutions. The article describing this new program stated:

> Western Reserve University, Case Institute of Technology, and the Cleveland Museum of Natural History last month announced plans for an expanded program of cooperation in the fields of geology and astronomy to begin July 1. The new program will provide for sharing of staffs and facilities in scientific fields by these three institutions, with a consequent improvement in operations thus permitting an expansion in instruction, research, and community service. The agreement provides for joint appointments in geology and astronomy, the exchange of

[15] *Progress Reports*, General Conference Commission on Christian Higher Education, Nashville, Tenn., No. 24, March 1960, p. 4. (For additional information on 3–2 programs, *see* Henry H. Armsby. The Three-Two Plan—An Education Experiment. *Higher Education*, December 1953, p. 61–64; *Trends in Engineering Education 1949–1959*, Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1961).

> facilities and collections for the greatest possible community benefit, and the exchange of courses among students.[16]

By means of this project, the resources of the community in astronomy and geology are being fully utilized. Duplication of the physical resources and facilities of Case Institute of Technology in astronomy and those of Western Reserve University in geology have been avoided. Case Institute of Technology has assumed leadership in teaching and research in the field of astronomy and Western Reserve University, in the field of geology. Informal programs for the general public are being provided by the Museum of Natural History. Certain items of instructional equipment and geological collections have been transferred from the universities to the Museum of Natural History.

After 2 years of preliminary negotiations to establish such a program, a written agreement, effective as of July 1, 1960, was entered into by the three institutions concerned. The agreement is to remain in effect as long as the three institutions feel that it is meeting its several objectives. Any institution may terminate the agreement by written notification to the other two institutions at least 6 months prior to the effective date of such termination.

An interinstitutional liaison committee consisting of three representatives from each of the two universities was appointed to provide an official channel of communication between the two institutions and to be responsible for the coordination of the programs, including the making of arrangements and recommendations involving the exchange of any instructional personnel between the cooperating institutions.

The program has been substantially aided financially by a donation in excess of $100,000, to be used on a matching basis over a 5-year period, for faculty salaries.

Maine Cooperative Project in Educational Television

A cooperative educational television project is now in the early stages of development in the State of Maine. Currently involved in this project are Bates College, Colby College, and Bowdoin College, which have entered into a joint agreement to operate Channel 10. The three institutions will share the cost of operation equally. The station, which is scheduled to begin operation in the fall of 1961, will reach 54 percent of the State's population. It will have its own staff, which will report to a Board of Trustees of nine members, three from each institution.

Interinstitutional Cooperation on a Larger Scene

The primary purpose of this chapter has been to stimulate interest in the development of interinstitutional cooperative arrangements in higher education by presenting to the reader concise descriptions of representative programs already in effect. The emphasis here has been on local area and State undertakings; however, in order to indicate the broad geographic scale on which it is possible—and, apparently, feasible—to undertake cooperative relationships in higher education, five regional programs are reported below.[17]

Writing on regionalism in higher education in 1937, Dr. O. J. Hagen, then a member of the Board of Regents of the University of Minnesota and president of the Association of Governing Boards of State Universities and Allied Institutions, observed:

> We are just beginning to awaken to the fact that regionalism as a concept has much significance for us. . . . Many colleges and universities are distributed without much rhyme or reason. They overlap, they duplicate, they compete. . . . Almost every one of these institutions tries to do its work just as though there were no other institution near it. . . .[18]

The regional concept in interinstitutional co-

[16] *Toward Higher Education.* Trenton, N.J.: New Jersey State Department of Education. Vol. I, No. 1, March 1960.

[17] The reader may question why the five programs which follow are selected for extensive description while the programs of the Southern Regional Education Board, Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, and New England Board of Higher Education are not. The reason for this is that this report seeks to call attention to cooperative programs negotiated between or among institutions directly by the board of control and administrations of the institutions involved, rather than through an intermediary agency such as the board or central office of an interstate compact in higher education. This is not to disregard, however, the excellent stimuli to interinstitutional cooperation, both direct and indirect, that have been provided by the interstate compact organizations in each of their regions.

[18] Quoted in *Cooperation and Coordination in Higher Education,* by Arthur J. Klein *and* Franklin V. Thomas, Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1938. p. iii.

operation in higher education has attracted increased attention since the pronouncement by Dr. Hagen nearly a quarter of a century ago; it has grown and expanded as additional regional cooperative efforts have come into existence and successfully proved themselves.

Southern Regional Training Program in Public Administration

An early venture in the pooling of higher educational resources on a regional basis is the Southern Regional Training Program in Public Administration. In 1944, a plan for a program of graduate training in public administration to serve the Southern Region was presented to the General Education Board, which made an initial grant to establish such a program. In the first year of operation—1944–45—the University of Alabama, University of Georgia, and University of Tennessee were the participating institutions. In 1945, the University of Georgia withdrew from the program and was replaced by the University of Kentucky.

Under the Southern Regional Training Program, compensated internships in public agencies —Federal, State, and local—are made available to graduate fellows. The internship is followed by a 9-month program of course work at the three cooperating institutions, upon the successful completion of which the student is awarded a Certificate in Public Administration, conferred jointly by all three institutions. This program, when supplemented by a Master's thesis done under the supervision of one of the three universities selected by the student, culminates in the conferring of the Master's degree.

The 9-month program of course work is carried on as follows: During the fall quarter, the student pursues a public administration-political science curriculum at the University of Alabama. A related program of study is carried during the winter quarter at the University of Tennessee, and, during the spring quarter, at the University of Kentucky.

The governing committee for this program consists of four representatives, one from each of the three universities and one from the Tennessee Valley Authority. The governing committee meets in April to select those students who will participate in the program. Selection is based on test results, undergraduate college records, and statements from personal references. Before being assigned to a summer internship program with Federal, State, or local agencies, the students are given a week of orientation at the University of Alabama. The program is headed by an Educational Director, who is located on the University of Alabama campus. Applications for fellowships are submitted to the Educational Director. During the internship period, the Educational Director visits the students for individual conferences.

Grants from the General Education Board financed the cost of operation of the program until 1951, at which time the States of Alabama, Kentucky, and Tennessee began underwriting the cost *pro rata*.

Two basic concepts underlie the establishment of the Southern Regional Training Program in Public Administration: (1) Improvement of the quality of public service in the Southern Region through the training and development of a junior management corps; and (2) Improvement in the quality of educational offerings and instruction at each of the participating institutions through the operation and maintenance of a cooperative regional graduate training program.

Associated Colleges of the Midwest

In 1958, with the aid of a Ford Foundation grant of $525,000, 10 midwestern liberal arts colleges launched a broad cooperative plan to improve their educational and financial conditions. The 10 institutions are located in Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, and Wisconsin and include Beloit, Carleton, Coe, Cornell of Iowa, Grinnell, Knox, Lawrence, Monmouth, Ripon, and St. Olaf Colleges. The organization, an outgrowth of the Midwest Athletic Conference, is known as the Associated Colleges of the Midwest, or ACM. The aim of ACM is:

> . . . to achieve steady improvement in the quality of their educational programs through strengthening and making the best use of their available resources. The assumption is that they can accomplish some things collectively that they cannot do as well singlehandedly. Although ACM will conduct joint studies and experiments and certain joint operations, each

member college will retain full independence of control over its own affairs.[19]

Cooperation in many of the following areas is expected as a result of this 10-college affiliation: standardization of admissions procedures and scholarship qualifications; pooling of library resources; establishment of a joint office for student recruitment; sharing of faculty; expansion of cooperative arrangements for faculty recruitment; promotion of joint purchasing, research, and fund raising.

The Board of Directors of ACM is composed of the presidents of the 10 member colleges. The staff of the organization is headed by a President. Other staff personnel are: a Program Director, a Language Project Coordinator, and three Secretaries. The central staff office is located in Chicago; office of the Language Programs Coordinator is at Beloit College.

In cooperation with the Argonne National Laboratory—a leading center for research into the peaceful applications of atomic energy, operated for the United States Atomic Energy Commission by the University of Chicago—ACM has conducted a research program for faculty members and a semester program for advanced students in biology, chemistry, and physics.

One of the more recent cooperative projects to be undertaken by ACM is a federally financed 3-year $250,000 experimental program to improve the teaching of foreign languages in this country. Funds for conducting this program will be made available by the U.S. Office of Education under the Language Development Program of the National Defense Education Act.

The purpose of this project is to experiment with strengthening the undergraduate curricula in modern foreign languages so that future language teachers will be prepared to play an effective role in the new language programs being developed in the Nation's high schools. ACM will coordinate language classes and experiments.

A cooperative insurance program has been initiated by ACM, to review the insurance needs and resources of the member institutions and to secure improved insurance coverage at lower cost. This project has also assisted in making improved and less expensive insurance available to other nonprofit organizations in the four-State area. Other ACM activities include: a comparative survey of library resources, facilities, and operations; programs for the enrichment of campus life; coordination of student aid programs; and the pooling of information on students, faculties, college operations, and budget and financial administration.

ACM was launched with financial support from the Ford Foundation, other donors, and the member institutions. Additional support has come from the Lilly Endowment, the United States Steel Foundation, the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, the Johnson Foundation, and the member institutions.

[19] Associated Colleges of the Midwest. *Science*, 129:886, Apr. 3, 1959.

Associated Rocky Mountain Universities

Another of the recent regional (interstate) efforts to enlarge and improve higher education opportunities through interinstitutional cooperation is that of the Associated Rocky Mountain Universities, Inc. (ARMU), an organization composed of 20 higher education institutions[20]—18 public and 2 private—in the 8 States of Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. Formally organized in the spring of 1959, ARMU is primarily concerned with the development of new, and the optimum utilization of current, resources in the fields of science and engineering. All member institutions offer graduate study in science and engineering, the criterion for membership. The presidents of the 20 participating institutions constitute ARMU's Board of Directors. Five members of the Board comprise the Executive Committee; an Executive Director heads the staff personnel.

Two regional organizations which played significant roles in the establishment of ARMU are the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE) and the Rocky Mountain

[20] Arizona State University; University of Arizona; Colorado School of Mines; Colorado State University; University of Colorado; University of Denver; Idaho State College; University of Idaho; Montana School of Mines; Montana State College; Montana State University; University of Nevada; New Mexico Highlands University; New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology; New Mexico State University; University of New Mexico; Brigham Young University; University of Utah; Utah State University; University of Wyoming.

Science Council. Other agencies, such as the National Science Council and the National Science Board, were frequently called upon for suggestions and counsel during the formative stages of organization.

Instead of embarking upon a specific program immediately following its inception, ARMU's Executive Committee agreed that considerable time should initially be devoted to making a thorough exploration of the total program possibilities of the organization. This adopted *modus operandi* thus enabled the Executive Director to visit the member institutions, talk with the Board of Directors, faculty members, and others concerned, and establish contacts with private foundations, government agencies, and national organizations prior to the institution of a formal operating policy and program.

Actually, recommendations for specific ARMU programs were not received from the Executive Director until the spring of 1960, at the annual meeting of the Board, at which time five major program areas were approved for intensive development. These areas were: interdisciplinary research on materials, research in weather modification, studies of natural resources problems, studies concerning pre-college science instruction, and special administrative functions.

One special aspect of ARMU's envisaged total program involves the establishment of centers for advanced studies, "centers which are sizable aggregations of facilities and staff and serve higher education in a wide geographical area. . . ."[21] Such centers are expected to be autonomous in nature, with degrees earned by students at the centers being awarded by the student's "home" institution. It is anticipated that the facilities of the centers will be quite highly utilized during the summer months.

From the very outset, ARMU has addressed itself to the fundamental question: What is the best deployment of the educational and research resources of the area? As stated in its *First Annual Report*, issued July 1, 1960:

> The pooling or sharing of programs, facilities, and professional talent—in selected fields and in special ways—appears to constitute the most powerful instrument at hand for providing, for the many who should have them, research and educational opportunities which are truly commensurate with the times.
>
> Thus ARMU signalizes a commitment, a dedication, to the more imaginative use of human and other resources in the interwoven causes of education and advancement of knowledge. In pursuit of this goal, the leaders of 20 universities have acted together to construct a new organizational framework for collaborative effort, one to elevate research and education to the new needs.[22]

ARMU's programs in operation in the immediate future will attract considerable attention from workers in higher education for the purpose of appraising the merits of these programs and of endeavoring to determine the possibilities of a similarly structured mechanism for other academic and research fields.

Committee on Institutional Cooperation ["Big Ten" Institutions and University of Chicago]

At a meeting held in December 1957, presidents of the "Big Ten" universities (Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Michigan State, Minnesota, Northwestern, Ohio State, Purdue, and Wisconsin) adopted a resolution setting up a special committee consisting of one representative from each of the 10 institutions to develop basic plans leading to further interinstitutional cooperation.

In 1958, the University of Chicago was invited to place a representative on the committee, and the new committee chose as its formal name, "The Committee on Institutional Cooperation of the Council of Ten and the University of Chicago." Following the securing of a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York for the purpose of studying existing cooperation and the possibility of additional cooperation among the 11 institutions, the committee set up a staff office on the University of Illinois campus at Urbana. Under the grant from Carnegie Corporation, C.I.C. will be able to continue its operations through fiscal 1963. At that time, other financing, possibly from the participating institutions, will be necessary to maintain the program.

[21] Associated Rocky Mountain Universities, Inc., *First Annual Report*, July 1, 1960. p. 9.

[22] Op. cit., p. 1–2.

In the spring of 1960, the Committee was reorganized and the headquarters moved from Urbana to Purdue. Present staff personnel include a Director, employed on a quarter-time basis, and an Associate Director, employed on a full-time basis. A major expansion of functions of the Committee was announced in connection with its reorganization. In the future it will aid cooperating institutions in joint planning in construction of facilities. A University Facilities Research Center will be established at Purdue.

Chief functions of the new research center will be: a clearinghouse for information about educational facilities among the 11 institutions; a central repository for materials gathered from national sources; and the conduct of research and the dissemination of results on matters of common interest.

Recent cooperative undertakings include a broad graduate training program in bioclimatology, programs in geography and landscape architecture, and a study of the seven colleges of pharmacy in the member institutions.

Studies which C.I.C. has completed to date include: *State Institutional Relationships; Cooperative Programs; Regional Cooperation in Higher Education in the United States and Its Meaning for the Midwest; Regional Cooperation in Higher Education: Aid or Hindrance; Sabbatical Leaves; Requests of C.I.C. Institutions for Assistance in the Development of New or Expanded Graduate Programs; Degrees Awarded by Schools in C.I.C.; Where C.I.C. Schools Get Their Students; Language Area Programs;* and *Higher Education and the Lobbyists.*

Memoranda have been issued by the C.I.C. under the following titles: *Summary of Colleges, Schools, Departments, and Graduate Fields of Specialization in C.I.C. Universities; Origin and Control of Teacher Educational Programs in C.I.C. Universities; Policies on Movie Rights and Related Subjects;* and *Status of Librarians in C.I.C. Institutions.*

Miscellaneous reports of C.I.C. include: *Digest of Membership and Functions of Western Conference; Faculty Athletic Committees and Boards; Resident Tuition Fees in C.I.C. Institutions; Student Economics;* and *Summer Session Salary Practices.*

Interuniversity—Atomic Energy Commission Cooperative Projects

A variety of cooperative activities in the field of nuclear technology have been carried on between a number of higher institutions, widely located geographically, and the United States Atomic Energy Commission. Among these cooperative projects are the Oak Ridge Research Participation Program, the Argonne National Laboratory Sponsoring Institutions Program, and the American Society for Engineering Education—AEC Summer Institutes on Nuclear Energy.

One of the problems of higher institutions in assuming their proper roles and responsibilities in developing atomic energy curricular programs is the shortage of adequately trained instructional staff to teach courses in nuclear energy. To remedy this situation, AEC sponsors institute programs at universities and AEC laboratories to give faculty members specialized knowledge in atomic energy techniques. Moreover, during summer periods and sabbatical leave periods, AEC employs faculty personnel from higher institutions to give them practical experience for later application in the teaching of courses in nuclear energy.

Financial grants made by AEC to colleges and universities for the purchase of expensive equipment and nuclear materials help to insure the adequacy of the practical aspects of specialized training in various areas of nuclear study. AEC scientists are available to higher institutions as lecturers, consultants, and resource persons. Other aspects of the AEC—higher institutions cooperative projects include: graduate fellowship programs in the life sciences and nuclear technology, AEC research contracts with colleges and universities, and AEC sponsorship of certain highly specialized, advanced courses in nuclear techniques.

Oak Ridge Research Participation Program.—The Oak Ridge Institute of Nuclear Studies is a nonprofit corporation of 36 southern universities located in 15 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. The Institute was chartered in 1946 to advise and assist in arranging curricular and methods programs of education, research, and development in nuclear science and atomic

energy. Specific programs are administered by the Institute, under contract with the Atomic Energy Commission, and with the cooperation of Oak Ridge National Laboratory and other installations.

Under the Oak Ridge Research Participation Program, university faculty members may participate in pure or applied research at Oak Ridge laboratories. This program is of mutual benefit—to the participant and to the installation where he is engaged in the research. Benefits realized by the participant are passed on to his university through the application of the knowledge gained to his campus research and teaching program. Areas of research included in the participation program are: biology, ceramics, chemistry, health physics, mathematics, metallurgy, physics, reactor physics, solid-state physics, reactor engineering, chemical engineering, and shielding. As of 1958, faculty members from 115 colleges and universities in 38 States and the District of Columbia had participated in this program.

Argonne National Laboratory Sponsoring Institutions Program.—The Argonne National Laboratory, a major center of atomic energy research, was established in 1946 by the University of Chicago, and is operated by that institution under contract to the United States Atomic Energy Commission. The work of the Laboratory is about evenly divided between basic research in atomic energy and applied research in reactor development. Research areas include physics, chemistry, biology and medicine, chemical engineering, electronics, high energy physics, mathematics, metallurgy, radiological physics, reactor engineering, remote control engineering, and solid state science.

Since its establishment in 1946, the Laboratory has shared its facilities with research scientists, faculty members, and students from the colleges, universities, and other scientific institutions in the Midwest.

The Associated Midwest Universities, an organization composed of 29 universities, the Mayo Foundation, and the Battelle Memorial Institute, was established primarily as a cooperating group to work with the Argonne Laboratory in facilitating its use by qualified personnel and students from the cooperating (and other) research and educational institutions. Member institutions of AMU are located in 12 midwestern States. Relationships of AMU to Argonne National Laboratory are quite similar to those of Oak Ridge Institute of Nuclear Studies to Oak Ridge National Laboratory.

Summary and Conclusions

In this chapter have been presented descriptions of selected interinstitutional programs and arrangements operative at local, State, and regional levels. Some of these have been in effect for a number of years and others have been of more recent origin. Some of the agreements reported have been between two higher education institutions or between one such institution and another community agency or enterprise; in other instances, the cooperating institutions have numbered as many as 30. In every case, the institutions involved have recognized the value of cooperative effort in the development of new programs and in the reinforcement of those already established.

Such programs and arrangements as those delineated have been established and proved to be successful in practically every aspect of college and university administration and operation—administrative services and programs, faculty relationships, student services and programs, and curricular and research areas, including educational television and other recently developed processes and techniques. In the foreseeable future, it appears likely, therefore, that colleges and universities will be breaking more and more with tradition and will increasingly engage in new and different collaborative ventures. Whether these efforts will be great enough or soon enough to meet successfully the challenge of the times is open to conjecture and debate.

CHAPTER III

Planning for Interinstitutional Cooperation in Higher Education

COOPERATIVE EFFORTS of any type obviously do not happen by chance. They are, as a general rule, carefully planned and thoughtfully examined before they are initiated. In view of the traditionally individualistic and local character of higher education institutions, it is understandable that the planning of interinstitutional programs has seen greatest fruition, thus far, at the local, State, or regional level. The probability that such areas as a metropolitan region, a State, or a cluster of neighboring communities will become the laboratories for further developing cooperative planning in higher education is strengthened by the impetus of the increasing movements toward city and regional planning. Though essentially based at the institutional, State, and regional level, therefore, the outcomes of greater development of interinstitutional higher education programs have significance to the entire Nation.

The purpose of this chapter is (1) to show how advance planning favorably influences efforts to promote the establishment of more adequate cooperative arrangements among area higher education institutions, and (2) to demonstrate the relationship between informal cooperative programs and relatively more formalized arrangements. A specific case study, reported below, has been employed to accomplish these purposes.

Interinstitutional Cooperation in the Washington, D.C., Area: A Case Study

In 1959, the Division of Higher Education of the United States Office of Education sponsored a Conference on Interinstitutional Cooperation in Higher Education in greater Washington, D.C., to explore the need for further cooperative undertakings, the extent and understanding of such need, and what steps should be taken to move ahead in establishing an adequate program. Conference personnel included representatives from the U.S. Office of Education, the Retired Professors Registry, the National Bureau of Standards, and six Washington area universities—The American University, The George Washington University, Georgetown University, Howard University, The Catholic University of America, and The Johns Hopkins University (School of Advanced International Studies).

Inception of Conference

This conference grew out of a suggestion by the Washington Higher Education Group, a local association of individuals in the field of higher education, that some inquiry be made in the Washington, D.C., area of the possible advantages to be gained from closer cooperative relationships among the higher education institutions located there. It was further suggested that the initial effort in this inquiry be made by the U.S. Office of Education. Accordingly, the Office established exploratory communication with representatives of the several institutions in the area, and with representatives of certain other area organizations and agencies to sound out these persons regarding the proposal. The representatives of the higher institutions were drawn largely from officials administratively responsible for academic affairs and, particularly, graduate programs. A favorable reaction to the proposal resulted in the calling of the conference.

First Conference Session

At the outset of the first (October 20th) conference session, a summation of past and current efforts in interinstitutional cooperation in higher education was presented to the group; this presentation included information on areas of cooperation, types of cooperation, and several specific cooperative programs currently in operation in the Nation.

In a subsequent discussion by the conferees, consideration was given to such topics as cooperative planning, statewide cooperation by reason of legislative action, areas of voluntary cooperation, and coordination of related cooperative arrangements within a metropolitan area.

Later in the conference session, expressions of interest in interinstitutional cooperation in higher education were registered by representatives from the various institutions and organizations. As reported in the Conference Minutes, "There seemed to be some hesitation on the part of the institutional representatives to express [such] interest . . . until an exploration is made of what is now being done cooperatively in the Washington Metropolitan Area."

Possible Types of Cooperation.—In the discussion of the Conference much attention was drawn to the several types of cooperative relationships which were felt to be needed or which might be valuable in the Washington Metropolitan Area. The group felt that the needs in Washington were both qualitative and quantitative, and that, in considering possible ways of cooperative relationships, aims as well as facilities available should be studied. For example, interest was expressed in seeing universities give more credit to students for courses taken at the National Bureau of Standards Graduate School. Cooperative relationships in educational television and a common calendar of activities and courses were suggested, and concern was shown over the problem of the institutions in the Washington Area finding available places for their students to do practice teaching.

It was felt that more cooperative relationships could be established between the institutional libraries, the Library of Congress, and other Government libraries in the Washington Metropolitan Area. The observation was made that the New York City Council on Higher Education (a formally organized voluntary cooperative higher education agency) is looking into the ways and means by which it can put the New York City libraries to more effective use; also, that one of the Peabody-Vanderbilt cooperative relationships is a joint university library which is located on the Vanderbilt Campus; this facility is especially valuable to graduate students and for special projects.

Study Proposal.—A major question taken up at the first conference session was the desirability of a study of what is being done cooperatively by the Washington Area institutions, what is planned in this respect for the future, and what needs will not be met by present or future plans. It was suggested that the study be based on what institutions are presently doing and what they feel might be done to their own advantage. The services of staff members in the State and Regional Organization Section of the Office of Education, Division of Higher Education, were requested and provided for the study.

Possibility of Foundation Support.—The group also explored the necessity and feasibility of a formal organization as a vehicle to obtain funds from various sources to aid interinstitutional efforts. Some support was indicated for the idea that more foundation support would be available if there were more evidence of formal cooperative activities and specific projects to which a foundation and other agencies might give support rather than informal cooperative activities.

Patterns of Organization Necessary.—Although considerable interest was expressed in possible development of more formal organization of one type or another, the conference discussion brought out the need for more factual information before wise action in this direction could be taken. The institutional representatives particularly felt that the proposed status study was the best basis for deciding what organization should be formulated to best advance interinstitutional cooperation. Beyond this the conference developed the suggestions that a committee be set up to work with the Washington Board of Trade and that working relationships be established with the Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies.

Conclusions and Outcomes.—In brief, the major results of the first conference session were that:

(1) It would be to the interest of the area and its educational institutions to explore further the possibilities of interinstitutional cooperation.

(2) An intensive study should be made covering the kinds of cooperation which now exist and what additional cooperative activities could be undertaken to the advantage of the institutions concerned.

(3) If there were a possibility of funds in the Washington area being made available for such a study, this should be capitalized upon for purposes of more intensive study of the area's needs and programs. If such funds, however, were not found to be readily available, and if area institutions so desired, the study could be undertaken in cooperative relationship by a committee made up of faculty members of the institutions of higher education in the Washington Area and staff members of the Office of Education.

(4) A report should be made by each institutional representative of the Conference to his President, and another meeting set up with Presidents or their representatives in about a month to explore whether or not there should be some continuing action taken at that time.

(5) Office of Education, Division of Higher Education staff members should continue to provide sponsorship of this activity and assume the responsibility of communicating with the representatives present. They also were assigned responsibility to furnish conferees with a report of this Conference and set up the next meeting.

Current Cooperative Projects in Higher Education in the Washington Metropolitan Area (November 1959)

Prior to the convening of the second session of the Conference on Interinstitutional Cooperation in the Washington Metropolitan Area (Nov. 23, 1959), an effort was made to identify specific examples of cooperation now existing among the institutions of higher education in this area, by way of giving the conference representatives a clear and accurate picture of the current situation. A summary of the data submitted by the different institutions in response to the inquiry directed to them for this purpose is shown in the table on page 31.

In the identification of cooperative projects in higher education being carried on in the area, it was the intent to deal in specifics, as may be observed by examining the classification format for the data summary: I. Official Title of Cooperative Project; II. Institutions Involved in the Cooperative Project; and III. Person(s) in Charge of Cooperative Project. However, it soon became evident that the programs in effect did not easily lend themselves to this type of classification. For example, in table 1, category I, relating to titles, it will be noted that only 3 of the 18 projects summarized have been assigned official titles as such. This is doubtless due, in part at least, to the informal nature of most of these activities, from the standpoint of their conception, organization, administration, and operation. The three instances in which cooperative projects have been specifically titled—the Greater Washington Educational Television Association, Inc., the Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies, and the Washington Semester at American University—represent more highly formalized endeavors.

The information in categories II (identifying institutions) and III (relating to persons in charge of programs) was much more readily identifiable for proper classification. Even here, however, some evidence of the informality of procedures was found in that there was one instance of divergence of information received from different sources concerning the institutions participating in a specific project.

Three of the 18 projects were in the area of administration and the remainder in the area of programs. Seventeen were identified prior to the second conference session. One additional cooperative arrangement—the Washington Semester at American University—was added during the open discussion.

Two facts which stand out in special relief in connection with this exploratory survey were noted as possible points of departure for later and more detailed study: 1. Whether or not *the informal nature* of the cooperative projects noted was, in fact, advantageous or an impediment to successful achievement of their objectives. 2. The apparent absence of a central source of information concerning specific instances of interinstitutional cooperation.

Interinstitutional Cooperation in Higher Education in the Washington Metropolitan Area—1959

I. Official Title of Cooperative Project	II. Institutions Involved in Cooperative Project	III. Person(s) in Charge of Cooperative Project
a. None or not identified (Coordination or public relations matters of mutual concern—meetings monthly)	a. Howard U.—George Washington U.—Georgetown U.—Catholic U.—Maryland U.—American U.	a. University Public Relations Persons
b. None or not identified (Equalization in assignment of "teaching beds" to, and certain services to be administered by, medical students of area universities training at D.C. General Hospital) (Joint agreement in assignment of academic rank to D.C. General Hospital staff officers working with junior and senior medical students of area universities)	b. George Washington U.—Howard U.—Georgetown U.	b. Deans of Medical Schools and the Public Health Officer of D.C.
c. None or not identified (Concerned with (1) patient care and (2) post-graduate training of residents and interns at Mt. Alto Hospital)	c. George Washington U.—Howard U.—Georgetown U.	c. "Deans' Committee of Mt. Alto Hospital" (3 Medical School Deans and Manager of Mt. Alto Hospital)
d. None or not identified (A "keeping in touch" on matters of mutual concern)	d. Howard U.—George Washington U.—Georgetown U.—American U.—Catholic U.	d. Deans of the University Law Schools
e. Greater Washington Educational Television Association, Inc.	e. Howard U.—George Washington U.—Georgetown U.—American U.—Catholic U.—Maryland U.—(also (1) 17 area public and private school systems and (2) area cultural organizations.)	e. Board of Directors (Dr. Arthur Fisher, Chairman). Meetings average two a month
f. Oil Purchase Agreement	f. Georgetown U.—George Washington U.—American U.—Catholic U.	f. Business Managers of the Universities
g. None or not identified (Interchange of graduate students for special course work)	g. Georgetown U.—Catholic U.	g. Chairman, Department of Anthropology, Catholic U., and Director, Institute of Languages and Linguistics, Georgetown U.
h. None or not identified (Individualized, selective instances of Masters' program students at Catholic U. receiving permission to secure engineering courses at University of Maryland	h. Catholic U.—Maryland U.	h. Not identified
i. None (Joint graduate seminars—held on one campus—attended by students from both universities)	i. George Washington U.—American U.	i. Deans of the Graduate Schools
j. None (Alternation of specialized graduate courses by the cooperating institutions)	j. George Washington U.—Maryland U.	j. Deans of the Graduate Schools

I. Official Title of Cooperative Project	II. Institutions Involved in Cooperative Project	III. Person(s) in Charge of Cooperative Project
k. None or not identified (Utilization by graduate student of American U. of the African Studies program of S.A.I.S.)	k. American U.—School of Advanced International Studies (Johns Hopkins U.)	k. Not identified
l. None or not identified (Arrangements for graduate language program students of the cooperating institutions to secure Chinese and Japanese language offerings at American U., and Arabic and Indonesian offerings at S.A.I.S.)	l. American U.—School of Advanced International Studies (Johns Hopkins U.)	l. Not identified
m. None or not identified (Arrangement for graduate students at American U. to secure courses in Physical Anthropology at Catholic U.)	m. American U.—Catholic U.	m. Not identified
n. Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies	n. Howard U.—George Washington U.—Georgetown U.—Catholic U.—American U.—Virginia U.—(also cultural, industrial, and research organizations)	n. Director of the Center
o. None or not identified (Combining of choirs for special Christmas program with D.C. National Symphony Orchestra)	o. American U.—Catholic U.—Howard U.	o. Not identified
p. None or not identified (Evaluation of graduate programs of Howard U. by representatives of other area institutions, as requested)	p. Howard U.—other area universities	p. Not identified
q. Washington Semester at American University	q. American U. and some 80 other colleges and universities throughout the country.	q. Dean, School of Government and Public Administration

Second Conference Session

The second session of the conference met on November 23, 1959. Following presentation of the summary of information on current cooperative projects itemized in the preceding table, two major areas of discussion were agreed upon: (1) What are the general reactions of the Washington institutions to the plan to further interinstitutional cooperation? and (2) What is the possibility of effecting an agreement to move into greater interinstitutional cooperation in the Washington area?

Reactions of Representative Institutions to Furthering Interinstitutional Cooperation.—In general, the institutional representatives present showed interest in planning for further interinstitutional cooperation. It was suggested, however, that decisions made in this conference not be considered commitments until presented to the individual institutions for approval. Much discussion centered on the role of the Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies, an agency identified in the survey of current projects as being formally organized and having as its main objectives research, graduate training, and citizen orientation. Consensus emerged that the activities of the Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies would not conflict with the activities of

the group for interinstitutional cooperation but would serve instead as an aid to them.

Proposed Steps Toward Development of a Program of Interinstitutional Cooperation in the Washington Area.—Members of the conference pursued further the question whether continued informal cooperation would be sufficient to meet higher education demands in the area or if a point had been reached or was approaching where more formal cooperation was necessary. It was noted that formal programs frequently develop by a series of informal actions when cooperating institutions in an area have recognized that increased structuring of procedures and programs is advantageous. The emergence of such interinstitutional programs as The University Center in Virginia and the Harrisburg Center for Higher Education are illustrations of this process.

After considerable discussion, it was the decision of the institutional representatives that they should move into this (cooperative) activity gradually and that need or readiness for formal organization was not yet clear. They did feel that it would be appropriate at this time for each institution, using its own means of selection, to designate representatives for a steering committee to explore the possibilities of interinstitutional cooperation. The activities of the committee were to include exploration of the extent that interinstitutional cooperation could be developed on an undergraduate as well as a graduate level; that additional collegiate institutions in the area might be involved in these discussions; and that noncollegiate education institutions such as the Smithsonian Institute and the Pan American Union might be brought in later on.

Members of the conference also discussed the possibility of a national conference on interinstitutional cooperation and felt there might be some merit in it. On the basis of an Office of Education report of the current status of cooperative programs in higher education, it was observed, a national conference might be planned.

At this time, the participants of the conference agreed upon the following resolution:

1. That a steering committee be established to continue to explore the possibility of interinstitutional cooperation;
2. That each institution interested in interinstitutional cooperation appoint a representative to the steering committee—method of selection of the representative to be left to the discretion of the institution;
3. That the committee be a continuing one rather than a changing one;
4. That the first meeting of the steering committee meet at the call of the representatives of American University.

Since the accomplishment of these two conferences, a more deliberate program of informal meetings of particular groups of officials of colleges and universities has been established. For example, the presidents of the institutions meet informally once a month. Business officers, graduate deans, registrars, and like groups also gather periodically. A recent development, moreover, is a joint proposal for interinstitutional cooperation in graduate studies for which foundation funds are being sought.

Summary and Conclusions

Interinstitutional cooperation among colleges and universities exists, or should exist, for the purpose of providing improved, expanded, and more economical opportunities for the clientele of higher education. To insure the maximum success of such cooperative endeavors, adequate planning, periodic evaluation, and subsequent modification as required are highly essential. This is particularly true for the more formalized programs, but it also holds for informal arrangements. The implication here is not that the programs should be "planned to death," but, rather, that the necessary attention be devoted to exploring, structuring, initiating, and maintaining them. Following the formal establishment of Associated Rocky Mountain Universities, Inc., for example, its Executive Committee agreed that, prior to the recommendation of specific programs for the agency, several months should be utilized in a complete exploration of all program possibilities.

A reference to the discussion topics from the case study reported in this chapter will serve further to illustrate the significance of adequate planning in the establishment of cooperative programs: "possible types of cooperation," "study proposal," "possibility of foundation support,"

"patterns of organization necessary," and "proposed steps toward development of a program of interinstitutional cooperation. . . ."

Planning for interinstitutional cooperation in higher education can also assist in coordinating such programs with those of other elements in the local, State, and regional matrix. The report of the Washington, D.C., Conference on Interinstitutional Cooperation has been employed, not only to demonstrate the usefulness of such techniques in planning for cooperative programs in higher education, but also to emphasize the fact that the planning should not be done in isolation —that is, within the strict environment of the colleges and universities concerned—but that it should give due concern to establishing appropriate relationships between the anticipated cooperative program(s) in higher education and the programs of the various other agencies within the particular milieu. Thus, the Washington, D.C., higher education institutions, in the process of exploring and thinking through their own cooperative possibilities, centered much discussion on the role of the Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies, arriving at a consensus that the activities of the Center would not conflict with those of the higher education group, but would serve instead as an aid to them.

Finally, not only is planning more likely to insure the success of the undertaking, but each of the institutions involved will be better oriented to the program through the participation of its representative or representatives in the planning process. In the case of the Washington, D.C., Conference on Interinstitutional Cooperation, the heads of the different participant institutions were enabled to become properly informed regarding the substance and outcomes of the meetings, through the reports carried back to them by their institutional representatives. On the basis of this information, appropriate further action could then be planned and initiated.

CHAPTER IV

Helps and Hindrances to Cooperative Projects

REPORTS of interinstitutional programs in higher education, generally speaking, dwell chiefly on the scope, procedures, and outcomes of projects. Information or insight on the reasons for success or failure of the enterprise is seldom given. From a review of sources used in preparing this report, an attempt was made to identify significant factors which, individually or collectively, encourage or deter cooperative arrangements among higher education institutions. These factors are identified and discussed without specific examples or illustrations because of some of the negative or critical observations that are advanced. Further research and study will be required to discover the degree to which such influences need to be present, either alone or together, to assure the successful operation of a cooperative program.

Factors Conducive to Cooperation

Administrative Leadership

Administrative leadership is perhaps the single most important element in stimulating and effectuating interinstitutional cooperation. It appears in every instance where successful programs have been developed. As used here, the term leadership means a willingness on the part of an institutional administrator to do the following things: (1) examine closely the purposes conceived for his institution by its constituency, board of control, administration, and faculty; (2) explore for gaps in the program of his own institution and admit the presence of weaknesses when found; (3) recognize and accept the strengths of a "rival" college in the same locale; (4) develop a feeling of mutual trust with other institutional leaders and discuss with them the respective strengths and weaknesses of each program offered within a particular area; (5) plan with them for the educational and social betterment of the larger community or service area; (6) be agreeable to sharing the resources of his own institution, as well as using the resources of others; and (7) initiate as well as encourage carefully conceived plans of interinstitutional cooperation.

In order for cooperation to be completely successful, the wholehearted support of institutional leaders would appear to be essential. To accomplish this end requires a willingness on the part of the administrator to admit that perhaps his institution cannot or ought not to try to do all things unilaterally and that competition which serves to weaken rather than strengthen the institutions involved is both detrimental and undesirable. Without this awareness and without the willingness to provide true educational leadership for the larger task, cooperative efforts are not likely to succeed.

Geographical Proximity

Another significant factor in the establishment of cooperative arrangements between two or more colleges, or between a college and other community resources, is that of geographical proximity. This factor is especially operative in respect to those arrangements which include exchange of staff, students, physical facilities, or material resources. The geographic nearness of institutions to each other can also greatly stimulate the joining of forces in various areas of study in an effort to produce increased and improved educational opportunities for all. It should be pointed out, however, that, while nearness often fosters cooperation, in some cases it may do just the opposite. Once again the administrative leadership of the institutions involved becomes a prime factor responsible for success or failure. It should also be noted at this point that, although the proximity of institutions is conducive to

cooperative ventures, separation by distance does not necessarily preclude the successful initiation and development of such undertakings.[1]

Recognition of Service Areas

One of the fields often overlooked by educators, both public and private, is that of *total* community service. In this connection, Sanford states that "Institutions with broad vision have seen in the inter-institutional agreement an opportunity to unite all the agencies for higher education within the area behind a program of greater service."[2] It seems rather incongruous for two or more colleges located in the same area to meet their individual obligations only to a particular segment of society. Actually, through study and exploration, colleges and universities have been able to discover and to institute essential areas of study which had not formerly been included within their offerings. As a result, the student clientele are given an opportunity to pursue programs suited to their *interests* as well as their needs. In many cases, only through cooperation between institutions has this been possible.

From another point of view, much benefit may accrue through recognition by higher education authorities that, in the institution's attempts to do too many things, it may not be doing any of them well. It is at a time like this that the seed for cooperation can take root. Then, those concerned can meet and decide upon specific areas of competence which each college should develop, and set about cooperatively building the strongest programs possible in specific areas, using the joint resources at hand.

Threat of Invasion or New Competition

The threat of invasion by a new institution may stimulate the development of interinstitutional cooperative plans. This also is a relatively frequent observation, though, understandably, specific mention of this as a prime moving factor is seldom set forth specifically in the literature or institutional reports. For example, when the need for a new program in a particular locale is recognized, and it becomes evident that none of the existing local area higher institutions are planning to meet this need, the establishment of a new institution may be proposed. With the realization of this fact, the established institutions, which have been thus alerted to the possibility of more competition for students, staff, and funds, may then look more favorably on interinstitutional cooperation as a means of meeting this need. This approach, although essentially negative in character, often motivates college and university personnel, working cooperatively, to attempt heretofore untried ventures or to accomplish that which was previously thought to be impossible.

Threat of Outside Control

Plans of cooperation may also be established as a defense mechanism by colleges in a particular area. For example, State or local bodies may indicate the necessity for devising new measures to meet particular educational needs, in which case State or local agencies would find it desirable to exercise certain control over the activities of the institutions involved. An awareness, on the part of educational leaders in the area concerned, of the existence of such a situation—in the incipient stages of its development, if possible—establishes in their own minds the particular educational needs and, further, can result in the development of a cooperative mechanism or arrangement to meet these needs. With the successful implementation of the cooperative arrangement, the threat of outside control is diminished, if not entirely dispelled.

External Influences

In some cases, forces from outside the immediate collegiate environment have been responsible for the initiation of cooperative undertakings between institutions. For example, State legislative committees have, in a number of instances, promoted a cooperative spirit between institutions of higher education by their insistence upon more efficient utilization of plant and other resources. In such cases, agreements are frequently made for such purposes as the joint use of specialized equipment and plant facilities, exchange

[1] See, in chapter II, "Interinstitutional Cooperation on a Larger Scene."

[2] op. cit., p. 45.

of staff, and standardization of record keeping.

The actions of accrediting agencies have at times caused institutions with poorly staffed departments to seek cooperative agreements with other institutions for the use and exchange of faculty and even laboratory facilities. In other instances accrediting organizations have been able to persuade college authorities of the desirability of cooperation with another institution as a means of bolstering an inadequate program.

Special study commissions, statewide and regional survey reports, and regional education boards within a State have also had an effect on cooperative planning among colleges in a State or regional area. Due to their acquaintance with the higher educational needs of a particular State, such commissions are frequently able to point to specific program and curricular areas which might possibly be strengthened through cooperation of higher education institutions within a State. Regional education boards encompassing several States and interstate study groups, in like manner, can serve a similar purpose for a broader geographic area. The relatively wider knowledge of needs of all such agencies as compared to a single college or university may result in the recommendation that a particular college or university not initiate a new program which can more economically and better academically be undertaken by students at a nearby institution. By the same token, they may encourage the cooperative advancement of new programs, where such are deemed necessary.

Factors Deterrent to Cooperative Arrangements

There are also certain forces which act as deterrents to the development of cooperative arrangements. In some instances these represent the negative side of factors already identified as helps; for example, a strong drive for institutional autonomy as opposed to a positive spirit of cooperation. Some of the more significant of these restrictive influences may be identified as:

(1) *Unilateral institutionalism.*—This situation results when a single college believes that it can do all things well by itself. For example, a college board, administration, and faculty may continue to add courses, physical facilities, and personnel, within narrow financial limitations, in order to maintain or enhance the reputation of the institution, even though a cooperative arrangement with another institution would have served the student clientele needs better and more economically. There may also be operative a narrow sense of institutional purpose, in which the college or university envisions itself as established to serve one particular group only.

(2) *Nescience.*—This constitutes an unawareness or indifference, on the part of college and university personnel, of the possibilities inherent in cooperation with other institutions, or a reluctance to explore such possibilities.

(3) *Special interest groups.*—Alumni and "friends" of a college may wish to retain without modification the old rivalries and competitions between their alma mater and other institutions.

(4) *Administrative policy and procedure.*—These can be so restrictive in language, intent, or execution that they prevent, or reduce to a minimum, opportunities for cooperation. They may also tend to reduce individual interest in exploring the possibilities of cooperation with another institution or community resource.

(5) *Legal barriers.*—Statutory provisions may prohibit an institution from participating with other institutions in cooperative agreements or activities. Where such legal difficulties exist, changes in the law will probably be necessary before interinstitutional agreements can be effected. While not clearly legal in nature, *political* factors may deter collective approaches to higher education problems. This is seen, for example, in some cases where legislators develop intense loyalties to particular institutions in a State system of public colleges and universities.

Summary and Conclusions

The trend toward coordination of higher education institutions, including the promotion and development of cooperative arrangements and programs, has been fostered in great part by the radical changes which higher education has undergone during the past century or more. The demand, on the part of society, for improved and expanded higher education offerings and facilities has caused these institutions to look more

and more toward the possibilities of interinstitutional cooperation and coordination as a means of satisfying this demand. Yet, as pointed out above, the factors which influence cooperative arrangements are not all positive in character. Indeed, in any given situation there is likely to be a pull and tug between conducive and deterrent elements, and the final success or failure of any effort to establish a cooperative venture will be primarily dependent upon the extent to which the negative elements are eliminated and the positive elements retained.

CHAPTER V

Principles and Guidelines for Establishing Interinstitutional Programs

FROM THIS REPORT, based on selected illustrations of interinstitutional cooperation in effect among colleges and universities, comes an indication of the promise further collective efforts hold for extending collegiate services to the Nation. There are good reasons for cooperation; there are many possible areas of cooperation. Pioneering efforts have identified and delineated specific methods by which cooperative ventures may be undertaken.

The success of these programs, some involving only two colleges and others encompassing the efforts of as many as 30 institutions working together, is shown by the length of continuous service many of them have enjoyed. At the same time, recognition of their success has prompted the more recent introduction of new programs similar in nature, as well as others of different character.

In Chapter I of this report were presented several factors which are generating need for and consideration of interinstitutional cooperation to extend services and overcome difficulties. It was pointed out that cooperation is becoming increasingly necessary in order to meet the demand of rising college enrollments, that the likelihood of restricted finances in the years ahead should prompt administrators to look at interinstitutional cooperation as one means of effecting economies, and that the anticipated shortage of trained faculty personnel may force institutions of higher learning to consider new methods for the proper and adequate utilization of staff resources. It was suggested that each of these factors, alone, provides sufficient basis for considering interinstitutional cooperative arrangements and that, taken together, they provide substantial evidence of the need for embarking on such plans.

The validity of identifying these factors as influencing interinstitutional cooperation is apparent from the description of the illustrations of joint programs described in chapters II and III. Both the bilateral and multilateral projects show repeatedly the intent of conserving institutional resources and promoting effectiveness in meeting mutual goals.

Existence of these pressures for innovative approaches to extending higher education services, however, does not automatically insure initiation and success of collective cooperative programs. Not every higher education institution may be in a position to join with another for cooperative purposes, and some may be unaware of the conditions under which cooperative plans may best be instituted. Factors which encourage or restrict the formation of such endeavors, which were identified and discussed in chapter IV of this report, need further review and analysis. As this is being done, greater utilization can be made of concepts already known and practices that have been tried and tested in existing cooperative arrangements. Observations of the practices, outcomes, and success of projects that have already been attempted suggest some tentative recommendations relative to the establishment of further interinstitutional cooperative endeavors.

Effecting Heightened Cooperation Between Institutions

Voluntary cooperation among higher education institutions takes many forms, encompassing a variety of arrangements, undertakings, agreements, contracts, and other relationships, both implicit and explicit, and ranging widely from the highly informal to the highly formalized.

This report has pointed out the informal character of many cooperative arrangements. The informal arrangement may be implicit in nature, with no recognized need for a written contract, agreement, or other document. Such arrangements are often successful and complete for the purposes set for them. In other instances, however, some greater formalization of plans may be required before an interinstitutional program can be undertaken and developed fully. In any case, policy and operational provisions of informal arrangements should be adhered to as closely and as conscientiously as are those of programs consummated by formalized, written agreements.

The formalization of cooperative programs can proceed along any of several lines, depending on the wishes of those involved in establishing the program and the conditions which underlie the specific situation. Obviously, the greater the scope and complexity of the cooperative venture, the greater the need for explicit, written statements covering the terms and provisions of agreement. Formal contracts committing institutions to participate in joint efforts with others represent a common procedure for consummating these undertakings. In the case of the 20-College Study of College Admissions Practices, for example, the colleges have contracted with each other and the U.S. Office of Education to participate in the program. Sanford's study [1] of interinstitutional agreements in higher education was essentially an analysis of *formalized, written* contracts, understandings, and connections established between colleges and universities for the purpose of improving and enlarging their educational offerings.

It has often been said that "nothing succeeds like success." In this connection, promoting increased cooperation between higher education institutions may be significantly aided by a greater knowledge, on the part of those responsible for establishing and maintaining cooperative programs, of the techniques of planning, programing, administrating, and operating of specific successful cooperative undertakings. All too frequently, agreements have been worked out with little, if any, knowledge of the structure and function of cooperative arrangements developed elsewhere. Administrators, board members, faculty, and others concerned should find it of value, and should be encouraged, to acquire and study examples of documents and related statements establishing and describing formalized interinstitutional cooperative projects. These may prove highly useful for guideline purposes, prior to the introduction of such programs in new situations and involving new institutions.

Some Tentative Principles

It is hoped that higher education administrators and staff members are willing to investigate the various possibilities which cooperative programs present for their particular institution. Moreover, it is hoped that the interested and informed administrator, staff member, and others concerned will feel the desire, if not the compulsion, to initiate essential and feasible programs of this type when it appears reasonably certain that such action will bring about an improved overall program. With these thoughts in mind, the following principles concerning the introduction of plans or programs of interinstitutional cooperation are suggested: (1) Using such possible stimuli as geographical proximity or involvement in like education programs or services, institutional leaders should make a determination of the colleges or universities which may feasibly establish a cooperative arrangement. (2) A meeting of representatives of all interested colleges or agencies should be held as early as possible to explore areas of possible cooperation; is not so important as inclusive representation at where the initiative for this meeting originated it. (3) Expressions of willingness to share the college's resources as well as to share the resources of others should be recorded. (4) Plans for the introduction of any contemplated cooperative arrangement should be formulated tentatively and reexamined in later meetings of representatives of the institutions. (5) Lines of communication should be open to all institutions in the new venture; communication within institutions likely to be participants should be encouraged, particularly in regard to the preliminary development of the program. (6) The roles, responsibilities, and commitments of each participating

[1] op. cit.

institution must be clearly delineated. (7) All participants must be kept abreast of the progress of the program. (8) While the possibility of failure should be recognized throughout the venture, strive to dispel every such possibility. (9) Following the inauguration and development of the first cooperative effort, there should be constant objective, concrete, and complete appraisal of the arrangement in all of its aspects. (10) From experience gained in the first venture, possibilities of and principles for embarking on additional programs of interinstitutional cooperation which offer promise of improving and advancing the total higher education program should be developed.

Concluding Statement

In conclusion, it should be emphasized that large, grandiose schemes are not required for successful interinstitutional cooperation. In fact, it may be better to begin in a relatively simple, informal way to introduce such programs. In this regard R. H. Eckelberry has written:

> We have heard a great deal in recent years about the need for cooperation among educational institutions. Everybody agrees that this is a fine idea, just as everyone is against sin. The actual practice of cooperating lags far behind its acceptance in theory. One of the reasons seems to be the belief that cooperation must be a large-scale affair; that institutions have first to work out a broad general policy and plan of cooperation before any specific cooperation programs can be initiated. This idea is disproved by the facts of everyday experience. Many groups and agencies—families, churches, civic organizations, schools, and so on—find it possible and desirable to cooperate in specific projects without reaching agreement as to ultimate objectives or general plans of operation. In spite of the fact that in some cases they have irreconcilable differences with respect to basic philosophies and long-range objectives, they cooperatively participate in particular projects. As they gain experience and confidence, they are likely to find additional projects on which they can work together. Cooperation is much more likely to proceed from the specific to the general than from the general to the specific.[2]

In its report, *The University and World Affairs*, the Committee states: "Improved mechanisms for cooperation among the universities, and between universities and other agencies (including those of government) that contribute to and draw upon their resources can greatly assist the difficult process of relating individual efforts to nationwide needs. A healthy pluralism demands not only a diversity in the programs of individual universities, but also the active cooperation of universities in a concerted approach to problems that face the nation as a whole." [3]

In this report the need for increased interinstitutional cooperation in higher education has been stressed. Ideas for cooperative plans have been offered, along with evidence that in some areas these ideas have been and are being successfully put into action. In the final analysis, it should be recognized that the growth and development of such programs rests in the hands of leaders in the field of higher education.

[2] R. H. Eckelberry. Inter-university Cooperation. *Educational Research Bulletin*, 33 :5, 1954.

[3] The Committee on the University and World Affairs, *The University and World Affairs*, 1960, p. 16. (Published by the Ford Foundation, 477 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N.Y.)

Selected References

The following list of selected references, relating wholly or in part to interinstitutional cooperation in higher education, includes items published from 1957 to the present. Some bibliographies are listed.

ASSOCIATED COLLEGES OF THE MIDWEST. *Science.* 129:886, Apr. 3, 1959.

Augmenting Businessmen's Liberal Education (Southwestern at Memphis, Pomona College, and University of Pennsylvania). *Case Book: Education Beyond the High School.* Washington: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. Vol. 1. Case No. 15, 1–3, Apr. 1, 1958.

BARBER, C. L., SHEEHAN, DONALD, STOKE, STUART M., *and* MCCUNE, SHANNON. *The New College Plan: A Proposal for a Major Departure in Higher Education.* Amherst, Mass.: Amherst College, 1958. 55 p.

BAUGHER, A. C. Harrisburg Area Center for Higher Education: Its Background and Program. *Journal of Higher Education.* 30:27–30, January 1959.

BOROFF, DAVID. California's Five-College Experiment. *Harpers.* 219:70–74, December 1959.

BUTLER, RAYMOND S. Interinstitutional Cooperation in Higher Education. *School and Society.* 87:44–47, Jan. 31, 1959.

College and Public School Cooperation in Providing Meaningful Student Teaching Experiences. *The Teachers College Journal.* 29:75–76, March 1958.

Colorado Public Institutions Authorize Eight Interinstitutional Councils. *Circular Letter No. 1.* American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities. p. 9, Jan. 11, 1960.

Cooperation Between a College and Industry in the Use of Teaching Resources (Williams College). *Case Book: Education Beyond the High School.* Washington: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. Vol. 1, Case No. 14, p. 1–3, Apr. 1, 1958.

Cooperation—The States Are the Key. *The Educational Record.* 39:140–146, April 1958.

Cooperative College Courses. *School and Society.* 87:412, Oct. 24, 1959.

A Cooperative Experiment in Higher Education. *Higher Education.* 14:11–14, September 1959.

Cooperative Intercollegiate Program of Graduate Studies in the Humanities and Social Sciences, Seven Southern California Colleges. *Case Book: Education Beyond the High School.* Washington: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. 1: 1–4, Nov. 1, 1957.

Cooperative Ph.D. Program in Massachusetts. *School and Society.* 88:132, Mar. 12, 1960.

Cooperative Program for the Preparation of High School Teachers. *The Journal of Teacher Education.* 9:149–151, June 1958.

Cooperative Programs—Study No. 2. Committee on Institutional Cooperation of the Council of Ten and the University of Chicago. 1959. 28 p.

DURHAM, GEORGE HOMER. WICHE: An Experiment in Interstate Cooperation and Regional Planning. *Western Political Quarterly.* 10:692–700, September 1957.

EELLS, WALTER CROSBY, *and* HOLLIS, ERNEST V. *Administration of Higher Education.* An Annotated Bibliography. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1960. 410 p. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Bulletin 1960, No. 7.

The Efficiency of Freedom. Report of the Committee on Government and Higher Education. Baltimore, Md.: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1959. 44 p.

ENARSON, HAROLD L. Federal-Regional Relationships in Higher Education. *Higher Education.* 16:3–9, February 1960.

ETTELL, MERTON W. *Interinstitutional Cooperation in Higher Education.* Albany, N.Y.: New York State Education Department, 1957. 118 p.

Evening College for Adults, The Earlham College—Indiana University Center. *Case Book: Education Beyond the High School.* Washington: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. 1: 1–4, Nov. 1, 1957.

Experiment or Conformity in the Small College. *The Journal of Higher Education.* 28:310–311, June 1957.

FITZROY, HERBERT W. K. *Cooperation Among Institutions of Higher Learning in the Community.* Richmond, Va.: University Center in Virginia, 1958. 11 p.

FRANKEL, CHARLES, *ed. Issues in University Education: Essays by Ten American Scholars.* New York: Harper and Bros., 1959. 175 p.

FREDERICK, WILLIAM L. *Some Changes in the Organization of Higher Education.* Chicago: Council of State Governments, 1957. 13 p.

——— *The States and Higher Education.* Chicago: Council of State Governments, 1957. 27 p.

GLENNY, LYMAN A. *Autonomy of Public Colleges.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1959. 325 p.

——— State Coordination of Higher Education. *Facing the Critical Decade* (Proceedings of the Western Regional Conference on Education Beyond the High School). Boulder, Colo. 1957.

HATCH, WINSLOW R., *ed. Reporter.* Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, March 1959. 78 p. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, (Circular No. 562).

——— *ed. Special Reports.* Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, March 1959. 59 p. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, (Circular No. 563).

——— *and* BENNET, ANN, *eds. Reporter.* Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, March 1960. 55 p. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education (Circular No. 611).

——— ———, *eds. Reporter.* Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, September 1960. 89 p. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education (Circular No. 622).

Higher Education in a Decade of Decision. Washington: Educational Policies Commission, National Education Association, 1957. 152 p.

Institutional Cooperation and Coordination in Meeting New Responsibilities. *The North Central Association Quarterly.* 32:318–324, April 1958.

Intercollegiate Committee on Cooperation, Amherst, Mt. Holyoke, Smith College, and University of Massachusetts. *Case Book: Education Beyond the High School.* Washington: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. 1: 1–4, Nov. 1, 1957.

An Inter-Institutional Program of Teaching by Television (Oregon System of Higher Education). *Case Book: Education Beyond the High School.* Washington: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. Case No. 17, 1: 1–2, Apr. 1, 1958.

Inter-University Program in Italian Literature. *School and Society.* 88:165, Mar. 26, 1960.

Joint Clearing House for College Teaching Aides. *School and Society.* 88: 212, Apr. 23, 1960.

KOENKER, R. H. Cooperative Graduate Programs. *Journal of Teacher Education.* 10:507–512, December 1959.

LAVES, WALTER H. C. The Role of Institutions of Higher Learning in Developing Asian-United States Relations. *The Educational Record.* 39:287–292, July 1958.

Liaison Committee Recommends "Master Plan" for California Higher Education. *Circular Letter No. 1.* American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities. p. 1, Jan. 11, 1960.

MARTORANA, S. V., *ed. Coordinating 2-Year Colleges in State Educational Systems,* May 16–17, 1957. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1957. 86 p. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education.

——— State Boards of Higher Education and the Federal Government: Partners in Higher Education. *Higher Education.* 16:20, February 1960.

——— *and* HOLLIS, E. V. *State Boards Responsible for Higher Education.* Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1960. 254 p. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education (Circular No. 619).

——— *and* MESSERSMITH, JAMES C. *Advance Planning To Meet Higher Education Needs: Recent State Studies (1956–1959).* Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1961. 33 p. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education (Circular No. 633).

MOOS, MALCOLM, *and* ROURKE, FRANCIS E. *The Campus and the State.* Baltimore, Md.: The Johns Hopkins Press. 1959, 414 p.

MUGFORD, T. H. The Importance of Cooperation. *Facing the Critical Decade* (Proceedings of the Western Regional Conference on Education Beyond the High School). Boulder, Colo. p. 151–153, 1957.

New Directions and Opportunities in Graduate Education. *National Catholic Educational Association Bulletin.* 50:179–182, August 1959.

Organization in Larger American Universities (Administration). *Journal of Higher Education.* 30:489–504, December 1959.

PACKARD, S. R. Academic Cooperation. *The Educational Record.* 40:358–363, October 1959.

PATTERSON, F. D. Duplication of Facilities and Resources of Negro Church-Related Colleges. *Journal of Negro Education.* 29:368–376, summer 1960.

Regional Cooperation at Undergraduate Level Studies. *Higher Education.* 14:84–85, January 1958.

Regional Cooperation in Higher Education: Aid or Hindrance—Study No. 3, Supplement. Committee on Institutional Cooperation of the Council of Ten and the University of Chicago, 1959. 17 p.

Regional Cooperation in Higher Education in the United States and Its Meaning for the Midwest—Study No. 3. Committee on Institutional Cooperation of the Council of Ten and the University of Chicago, 1959. 36 p.

A Regional Educational Television Network for University Teaching. *College and University,* 33:303–308 and 311–312, spring 1958.

The Richmond Area University Center: An Experiment in Cooperation. *The Educational Record*, 38:241–249, July 1957.

Rocky Mountain Research Group Formed. *Circular Letter No. 17.* American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities. p. 10, Aug. 4, 1959.

Sharing Responsibility in Educational Planning. *The North Central Association Quarterly.* 32:311–312, April 1957.

SMITH, G. KERRY, *ed. Current Issues in Higher Education*, 1960. Proceedings of the Fifteenth Annual National Conference on Higher Education. Washington: Association for Higher Education, National Education Association of the United States, 1960.

State Institutional Relationships—Study No. 1. Committee on Institutional Cooperation of the Council of Ten and the University of Chicago, 1959. 14 p.

Statewide Study of Higher Education, The Florida Board of Control. *Case Book: Education Beyond the High School.* Washington: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. 1: 1–3, Nov. 1, 1957.

STEPHENS, J. California Junior and Senior Colleges Work Together in Curriculum Planning. *Junior College Journal.* 30:147–148, November 1959.

STEWART, B. Cooperation Among Liberal Arts Colleges. *Liberal Education.* 46:66–71, March 1960.

SUGG, REDDING S., *Jr., and* JONES, G. H. *Ten Years of Regional Cooperation in Higher Education.* Southern Regional Education Board, Louisiana State University Press, 1960.

Toward a Philosophy of Interinstitutional Cooperation. *The Educational Record.* 39:131–139, April 1958.

Toward Higher Education. Trenton, N.J.: New Jersey State Department of Education. 1:1–4, March 1960.

211—and Going Higher? *America.* 102:605, Feb. 20, 1960.

The University Center in Virginia (Formerly Richmond Area University Center). *Case Book: Education Beyond the High School.* Washington: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. Vol. 1, Case No. 16, p. 1–4, Apr. 1, 1958.

What's Happening in Teacher Education? *Journal of Teacher Education.* 10:507–512, December 1959.

☆U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1961—596780